arXiv:1611.02092v1 [math.AG] 7 Nov 2016

EXTENDABILITY OF AUTOMORPHISMS OF K3 SURFACES

YUYA MATSUMOTO

Abstract. A K3 surface X over a p-adic field K is said to have good reduction if it admits a proper smooth model over the integer ring of K. Assuming this, we say that a subgroup G of $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ is extendable if X admits a proper smooth model equipped with G-action (compatible with the action on X). We show that G is extendable if it is of finite order prime to p and acts symplectically (that is, preserves the global 2-form on X). The proof relies on birational geometry of models of K3 surfaces, and equivariant simultaneous resolutions of certain singularities. We also give some examples of non-extendable actions.

1. Introduction

Throughout this article, K is a complete discrete valuation field of characteristic 0, $\mathcal{O}_K$ is its valuation ring, and k is its residue field of characteristic $p \geq 0$ which we assume to be perfect.

Let X be a K3 surface over K with good reduction. In this paper we consider relations between the automorphism groups of X and of its proper smooth models over $\mathcal{O}_K$.

If X is an abelian variety, the theory of Néron models shows that the proper smooth model $\mathcal{X}$ is unique and that any automorphism of X extend to that of the model $\mathcal{X}$. To the contrary, a proper smooth model of a K3 surface is in general not unique, as there may exist flops, and this makes automorphisms of X not extendable in general to proper smooth models $\mathcal{X}$ of X.

Our main result are the following two theorems. One gives a sufficient condition for an action to be extendable, and the other gives examples that are not extendable. Here we say that G is *extendable* if X admits a proper smooth model equipped with a G-action extending that on X. For precise definitions see Section 2.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $G \subset \mathrm{Aut}(X)$ be a symplectic finite subgroup of order prime to p. Then G is extendable.*

This fails without the assumptions, as the next theorem shows.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $p \geq 2$ be a prime.*

Date: 2016/11/07.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14J28, 11G25, 14L30, 14E30.

(1) Let G be either $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ (in which case we assume $p \leq 7$) or $\mathbb{Z}$. Then there exists a K3 surface X defined and having good reduction over a finite extension K of $\mathbb{Q}_p$, equipped with a faithful symplectic action of G that is not extendable.

(2) Let G be either $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ (in which case we assume $p \leq 19$), $\mathbb{Z}/l\mathbb{Z}$ (l a prime ≤ 11 and $l \neq p$), or $\mathbb{Z}$. Then the same conclusion hold, this time with a non-symplectic action.

Here a group of automorphisms of a K3 surface is *symplectic* if it acts on the 1-dimensional space $H^0(X, \Omega^2_{X/K})$ trivially. It is known that if a symplectic resp. non-symplectic automorphism of a K3 surface in characteristic 0 has a finite prime order l then $l \leq 7$ resp. $l \leq 19$. So this theorem give examples in most of the cases where Theorem 1.1 does not apply. For orders $13, 17, 19$ see Proposition 6.6.

The origin of this study is a question of Keiji Oguiso asking whether the existence of a projective smooth model implies extendability of automorphism groups. Some of our examples admit projective smooth models, thus answer his question negatively.

To prove Theorem 1.1 and a part of Theorem 1.2, we use results of Liedtke–Matsumoto [LM15] on birational geometry of models of K3 surfaces and their equivariant versions (Section 4) to reduce it to the following local result on simultaneous equivariant resolution, which may be of independent interest.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $(B, \mathfrak{m})$ be a flat local $\mathcal{O}_K$-algebra of relative dimension 2 obtained as the localization of a finite type $\mathcal{O}_K$-algebra at a maximal ideal, with $B/\mathfrak{m} \cong k$, $B \otimes K$ smooth, and $B \otimes k$ an RDP (rational double point). Let G be a nontrivial finite group of order prime to p acting on B faithfully. Then B admits a simultaneous G-equivariant resolution in the category of algebraic spaces after replacing K by a finite extension if and only if the G-action is symplectic (in the sense of Definition 3.2).*

Here a simultaneous resolution is a proper morphism $\mathcal{X} \to \operatorname{Spec} B$ which is an isomorphism on the generic fiber and the minimal resolution on the special fiber. This will be proved in Section 3.

Currently we do not have any explanation why symplecticness arise as a key condition. It may be related to the fact that the RDPs in characteristic 0 are precisely the quotient singularities by "symplectic" group actions (cf. Remark 3.8).

To prove other cases of Theorem 1.2 we define in Section 2 the *specialization map* $\mathrm{sp}\colon \mathrm{Aut}(X) \to \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{X}_0)$ ($\mathcal{X}_0$ is the special fiber of $\mathcal{X}$) and show that, if g is extendable then the characteristic polynomials of g^* and $\mathrm{sp}(g)^*$ on $H^2_{\text{ét}}$ should coincide (Proposition 2.3). In Section 5 we give examples in which these polynomials differ.

As an side trip, we study this specialization map $\mathrm{sp}\colon \mathrm{Aut}(X) \to \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{X}_0)$. As will be seen in Section 6, $\mathrm{Ker}(\mathrm{sp})$ may have nontrivial members, both of finite and infinite orders. We show that if a finite order automorphism is in

Ker(sp) then its order is a power of the residue characteristic p (Proposition 6.1). In Section 7 we also give an example where the characteristic polynomial of the action of $\mathrm{sp}(g)^*$ on H^2 is irreducible (which never happens on H^2 of a K3 surface in characteristic 0).

Acknowledgments. I thank Keiji Oguiso for the interesting question, from which this work arose. I thank Hélène Esnault, Christian Liedtke, Yuji Odaka, Nicholas Shepherd-Barron for their helpful comments. I appreciate the kind hospitality of Institut de Mathématiques de Jussieu-Paris Rive Gauche where a large part of this work was done. This work was supported by JSPS Program for Advancing Strategic International Networks to Accelerate the Circulation of Talented Researchers, and by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 15H05738 and 16K17560.

2. Specialization of automorphisms of K3 surfaces

Definition 2.1. Let X be a proper surface over K.

(1) A *model* of X over $\mathcal{O}_K$ is a proper flat algebraic space $\mathcal{X}$ over $\mathcal{O}_K$ equipped with an isomorphism $\mathcal{X} \times_{\mathcal{O}_K} K \xrightarrow{\sim} X$. A *projective smooth model* is a model that is projective and smooth over $\mathcal{O}_K$, and so on. Note that a projective model is automatically a scheme.

(2) We say that X has *good reduction* if X admits a proper smooth model. We say that X has *potential good reduction* if $X_{K'}$ has good reduction for some finite extension K'/K.

(3) Let G be a subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$. A *G-model* is a model of X equipped with a G-action compatible with that of X. If G is generated by a single element g, we also call it a *g-model*.

(4) We say that $G \subset \mathrm{Aut}(X)$ (resp. $g \in \mathrm{Aut}(X)$) is *extendable* if, after replacing K by a finite extension, X admits a proper smooth G- (resp. g-) model.

We also introduce a related notion of *specialization* of automorphisms.

Proposition 2.2. *Let X be a K3 surface over K having good reduction.*

(1) For any proper smooth model $\mathcal{X}$ of X, an automorphism g of X extend to a unique birational (rational) self-map of $\mathcal{X}$ and its indeterminacy is a closed subspace of codimension at least 2. The induced birational self-map on the special fiber $\mathcal{X}_0$ is in fact an automorphism (a morphism), which we write $\mathrm{sp}(g)$ and call the specialization of g.

(2) Both the special fiber $\mathcal{X}_0$ and the specialization morphism $\mathrm{sp}\colon \mathrm{Aut}(X) \to \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{X}_0)$ are independent of the choice of the model $\mathcal{X}$. This morphism sp (of sets) is a group homomorphism.

Proof. (1) Take $g \in \mathrm{Aut}(X)$. Let $g^*\mathcal{X}$ be the normalization of $\mathcal{X}$ in the pullback $g\colon X \to X$. Then $g^*\mathcal{X}$ is another proper smooth model and it is connected to $\mathcal{X}$ by a finite number of flopping contractions ([LM15, Proposition 3.3]). It follows that g induces a birational self-map on $\mathcal{X}$ with indeterminacy of codimension at least 2.

Restricting to the special fiber $\mathcal{X}_0$, we have a birational self-map on a minimal surface $\mathcal{X}_0$, which are automatically a morphism.

(2) This again follows from the fact that two proper smooth models of X are isomorphic outside subspaces of codimension ≥ 2. □

Proposition 2.3. *Let X be a K3 surface over K having good reduction. Let $g \in \mathrm{Aut}(X)$ and let $\mathrm{sp}(g) \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{X}_0)$ be its specialization. Assume that the characteristic polynomials of g^* and $\mathrm{sp}(g)^*$ on $H^2_{\text{ét}}(X_{\overline{K}}, \mathbb{Q}_l)$ and $H^2_{\text{ét}}((\mathcal{X}_0)_{\overline{k}}, \mathbb{Q}_l)$ do not coincide. Then g is not extendable.*

Proof. The proper smooth base change theorem induces, for each proper smooth model $\mathcal{X}$, an isomorphism between $H^2_{\text{ét}}(X_{\overline{K}}, \mathbb{Q}_l)$ and $H^2_{\text{ét}}((\mathcal{X}_0)_{\overline{k}}, \mathbb{Q}_l)$. In general this isomorphism depends on the choice of the model. If $\mathcal{X}$ admits a g-action then this isomorphism is g-equivariant, and then the characteristic polynomials of $(g|X_K)^*$ and $(g|\mathcal{X}_0)^*$ coincide. (By definition $g|\mathcal{X}_0 = \mathrm{sp}(g|X_K)$.) □

Remark 2.4. This proposition cannot give a counterexample to Theorem 1.1 since, under the assumption of the theorem, the characteristic polynomials always coincide by Lemma 2.13 and Proposition 6.1.

We do not know whether the coincidence of characteristic polynomials implies extendability.

Corollary 2.5. *(1) Let X and g as above. Assume one of the following holds. Then g does not extend to any proper smooth model of X.*

(a) $g \neq \mathrm{id}$ and $\mathrm{sp}(g) = \mathrm{id}$.
(b) The number of eigenvalues of $\mathrm{sp}(g)^*$ that are roots of 1 is $< 22 - \rho$, where ρ is the geometric Picard number of X.
(c) The above number is $\leq 22 - \rho$, and g is of finite order.

(2) Let X_0 be a K3 surface over k and let $g_0 \in \mathrm{Aut}(X_0)$. Assume that the characteristic polynomial of g_0^* on H^2 is irreducible. Then g_0 is not the restriction of any automorphism of any proper smooth model $\mathcal{X}$ of any K3 surface X over any K (of characteristic 0).

Proof. (1) By the Torelli theorem, nontrivial g acts nontrivially on H^2. This proves (a). $\mathrm{NS}(X)$ and $T(X) = \mathrm{NS}(X)^\perp$ give $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$-stable subspace of $H^2_{\text{ét}}$. By [Huy16, Corollary 3.3.4], the eigenvalues of g on $T(X)$ are all roots of 1. If g is of finite order, $\mathrm{NS}(X)$ has a nontrivial g-invariant element (e.g. the sum of images under the powers of g of an ample line bundle). This proves (b) and (c).

(2) In characteristic 0 the characteristic polynomial cannot be trivial since both NS and T are nontrivial subspaces. □

Remark 2.6. If the condition of (2) is satisfied then X_0 is supersingular and the characteristic polynomial is a Salem polynomial (Lemma 7.3). We will see in Section 7 that such g_0 still may be the specialization of an automorphism in characteristic 0.

In practice it is easier to compute the specialization map if we use more general models.

Definition 2.7. (1) An *RDP surface* over a field F is a surface X such that $X_{\overline{F}}$ has only RDP (rational double point) singularities.

(2) An *RDP K3 surface* over a field is a proper RDP surface whose minimal resolution is a K3 surface. (In particular, a smooth K3 surface is an RDP K3 surface.)

(3) A *proper RDP model* of an RDP K3 surface is a proper model whose special fiber is an RDP surface. (The special fiber is then an RDP K3 surface. This follows from the next lemma and the classification of degeneration of K3 surfaces.)

(4) A *simultaneous resolution* of an proper RDP model $\mathcal{X}$ of an RDP K3 surface is a proper morphism $f\colon \mathcal{Y} \to \mathcal{X}$ from an algebraic space that is the minimal resolution on each fiber.

Note that for an RDP K3 surface X there is a canonical injection $\mathrm{Aut}(X) \to \mathrm{Aut}(\tilde{X})$, where $\tilde{X}$ is the minimal resolution.

Lemma 2.8. *If an RDP K3 surface X admits a proper RDP model, then the minimal resolution $\tilde{X}$ of X has potential good reduction.*

More precisely, if $\mathcal{X}$ is a proper RDP model of X over $\mathcal{O}_K$, then after extending K there exists a simultaneous resolution $\mathcal{Y} \to \mathcal{X}$ and then $\mathcal{Y}$ is a proper smooth model of $\tilde{X}$.

Proof. By extending K, we may assume that all singular points of X are K-rational. If X is not smooth, take an RDP $x \in X$, and let $\pi\colon \mathcal{X}' \to \mathcal{X}$ be the blow-up at the Zariski closure Z of $\{x\}$. Then $Z \cap \mathcal{X}_0$ consists of an RDP x_0 and the restriction of π on the generic resp. special fiber is the blow-up at x resp. x_0. Hence $\mathcal{X}'$ is again a proper RDP model of an RDP K3 surface. Repeating this, we may assume the generic fiber X is smooth.

If the generic fiber is smooth, then [Art74, Theorem 2] gives a (non-canonical) simultaneous resolution. □

Proposition 2.9. *Let $\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_2$ be proper RDP models of RDP K3 surfaces X_1, X_2 and $Z_i \subset \mathcal{X}_i$ closed subspaces that do not contain the special fiber $(\mathcal{X}_i)_0$. Let $g\colon \mathcal{X}_1 \setminus Z_1 \to \mathcal{X}_2 \setminus Z_2$ be a birational morphism. Then the specialization of the induced automorphism $\tilde{X}_1 \xrightarrow{\sim} \tilde{X}_2$ is the automorphism induced by $g|_{(\mathcal{X}_1 \setminus Z_1)_0}\colon (\mathcal{X}_1 \setminus Z_1)_0 \to (\mathcal{X}_2 \setminus Z_2)_0$.*

Proof. Proper RDP models $\mathcal{X}_i$ have simultaneous resolutions $\mathcal{Y}_i \to \mathcal{X}_i$. By adding the exceptional loci of these morphisms into Z_i, we may assume that $\mathcal{X}_i$ themselves are smooth. Since $\mathcal{X}_1$ and $\mathcal{X}_2$ are isomorphic outside closed subspaces of codimension ≥ 2 ([LM15, Proposition 3.3]), we may assume $\mathcal{X}_1 = \mathcal{X}_2$. Then the birational self-map of $\mathcal{X}_1$ in Proposition 2.2 is the one induced by g. □

We also need the relation between Ω^2 of the fibers of proper RDP models.

Lemma 2.10. *Let $(C, \mathfrak{n})$ an m-dimensional local ring of the (complete intersection) form $C = k[x_1, \dots, x_{n+m}]_0/(F_1, \dots, F_n)$ where $_0$ is the localization at the origin, and assume $U = \operatorname{Spec} C \setminus \{\mathfrak{n}\}$ is smooth. Then there exists a unique element $\omega \in \Omega^m_{C/k}|_U$ such that for any $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{n+m}$ the equality $\operatorname{sgn}(\sigma) \det((F_j)_{x_{\sigma(i)}})_{i,j=1}^n \omega = dx_{\sigma(n+1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge dx_{\sigma(n+m)}$ holds, and such ω generates $\Omega^m_{C/k}|_U$.*

The same holds if we replace $k[\dots]_0$ with its Henselization $k[\dots]^{\mathrm{h}}$ or completion $k[[\dots]]$.

Here F_{x_i} is defined by the equality $dF = \sum_i F_{x_i} dx_i$ in $\Omega^1_{k[\dots]_0/k}$ (or in ...). This coincides with the termwise partial differentiation of formal power series.

Proof. Straightforward. Note that at every point on U, we have $\det((F_j)_{x_{\sigma(i)}}) \neq 0$ for some $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{n+m}$. □

Lemma 2.11. *Let $(C, \mathfrak{n})$ be a 2-dimensional local ring over a field k and assume it is an RDP. Define U as above.*

(1) $\Omega^2_{C/k}|_U$ is trivial, and hence $H^0(U, \Omega^2_{C/k}) \cong H^0(U, \mathcal{O}) = C$.

(2) Let $\pi \colon X \to \operatorname{Spec} C$ be the minimal resolution. Then $H^0(X, \Omega^2_{X/k}) \to H^0(\pi^{-1}(U), \Omega^2_{X/k}) \xrightarrow{\sim} H^0(U, \Omega^2_{C/k})$ is an isomorphism.

Proof. It suffices to the assertion after taking étale local base change $C \to C'$; Hence we may assume C is of the form $C = k[x_1, x_2, x_3]^{\mathrm{h}}/(F)$, $F \in (x_1, x_2, x_3)^2$, $F \notin (x_1, x_2, x_3)^3$ ([Lip69, Lemma 23.4]).

(1) Indeed $\Omega^2_{C/k}|_U$ is generated by ω defined above.

(2) Let $C_1 = k[x_1, x_2/x_1, x_3/x_1]^{\mathrm{h}}/(F/x_1^2)$ be the first affine piece of $\operatorname{Bl}_{(x_1,x_2,x_3)} C$, and define C_2, C_3 similarly. Define ω and ω_i as in the previous lemma. Then we have $\omega_i = \omega$. If all C_i are smooth (hence $X = \bigcup \operatorname{Spec} C_i$) then we have $H^0(X, \Omega^2_{X/k}) = C_1\omega_1 \cap C_2\omega_2 \cap C_3\omega_3 = C\omega$. General case follows inductively from this. □

Lemma 2.12. *Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a proper RDP scheme model over $\mathcal{O}_K$ of an RDP K3 surface X and $\Sigma \subset \mathcal{X}$ the closed subset of RDPs. Then $H^0(\mathcal{X} \setminus \Sigma, \Omega^2_{\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{O}_K})$ is free $\mathcal{O}_K$-module of rank 1, with generator say ω, and $H^0(\mathcal{X}_0 \setminus \Sigma_0, \Omega^2_{\mathcal{X}_0/k})$ and $H^0(\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0, \Omega^2_{\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0/k})$ is generated by (the restriction of) ω, where $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}_0$ is the minimal resolution. If $\mathcal{X}$ admits an automorphism g, then this is compatible with the action of the automorphisms $g|_X$ and $g|_{\mathcal{X}_0} = \operatorname{sp}(g|_X)$.*

Proof. We have $\dim H^0(X \setminus \Sigma_K, \Omega^2_{X/K}) = \dim H^0(\mathcal{X}_0 \setminus \Sigma_0, \Omega^2_{\mathcal{X}_0/k}) = 1$ from the previous lemma. The former assertion follows from this and upper semi-continuity and the previous lemma. The latter is clear. □

We recall a result on the trace of finite order symplectic automorphisms.

Lemma 2.13. *Let X be a K3 surface over a field F of characteristic $p \geq 0$ and $g \in \operatorname{Aut}(X)$ a nontrivial symplectic automorphism of finite order prime*

to p. Then $\mathrm{ord}(g) \leq 8$*, the fixed points of g are isolated, and* $|\mathrm{Fix}(g)| = \varepsilon(\mathrm{ord}(g))$*, where* $\varepsilon(n) := 24(n\prod_{q:prime,q|n}(1+1/q))^{-1}$*. Moreover the trace of g^* on $H^2_{\text{ét}}(X_{\overline{F}}, \mathbb{Q}_l)$ (and on $H^2(X,\mathbb{Q})$ if $F=\mathbb{C}$) depends only on* $\mathrm{ord}(g)$ *and is equal to* $\varepsilon(\mathrm{ord}(g))-2$*. (In other words, the characteristic polynomial of g^* on H^2 depends only on* $\mathrm{ord}(g)$*.)*

We have $\varepsilon(n) = 24, 8, 6, 4, 4, 2, 3, 2$ for $n = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8$ respectively. The equality $\mathrm{tr}(g) = \varepsilon(\mathrm{ord}(g)) - 2$ holds also if $\mathrm{ord}(g) = 1$.

Proof. Characteristic 0: [Nik79, Section 5 and Theorem 4.7] proves everything except the value of the trace. [Muk88, Propositions 1.2, 3.6, 4.1] proves everything.

Characteristic $p > 0$: [DK09a, Theorem 3.3 and Proposition 4.1]. □

Corollary 2.14. *Let X is a K3 surface over a field F of characteristic 0 and $G \subset \mathrm{Aut}(X)$ a finite group of symplectic automorphisms. Define $\mu(G) = |G|^{-1}\sum_{g\in G}\varepsilon(\mathrm{ord}(g))$, Then the (geometric) Picard number of X is at least $25 - \mu(G)$.*

Proof. We may assume $F = \mathbb{C}$. Write $V := H^2(X,\mathbb{Q})$ (as a G-representation). By the previous lemma $\mathrm{tr}(V, g) = \varepsilon(\mathrm{ord}(g)) - 2$. Let $\{\rho\}$ be the set of irreducible representations of G and write $V = \sum a_\rho \rho$, $a_\rho \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Then we have $a_1 = (1 \cdot V) = |G|^{-1}\sum_{g\in G}\mathrm{tr}(V, g) = |G|^{-1}\sum_{g\in G}(\varepsilon(\mathrm{ord}(g)) - 2) = \mu(G) - 2$ (here 1 denotes the trivial representation). Since G acts trivially on the transcendental lattice $T(X)$ and G has nontrivial invariant subspace in $\mathrm{NS}(X)$, we have $\mathrm{rank}(T(X)) \leq a_1 - 1$. □

3. Local equivariant simultaneous resolutions

In this section we prove Theorem 1.3.

We often apply the following approximation lemma to the Henselization $A = R[x_1, \ldots, x_n]^{\mathrm{h}}$ of $R[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ at the origin, where $R = k$ or $R = \mathcal{O}_K$, and $I = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$.

Lemma 3.1 ([Art69, Theorem 1.10])**.** *Let R be a field or an excellent discrete valuation ring. Let A be the Henselization of a finite type R-algebra at a prime ideal and $I \subset A$ a proper ideal (not necessarily the maximal ideal). Given a system $f_j(Y) = 0$ ($Y = (Y_1, \ldots, Y_N)$) of polynomial equations with coefficients in A, a solution $\overline{y}$ in the I-adic completion $\hat{A}$ of A, and an integer c, there exists a solution y in A with $\overline{y}_i \equiv y_i \pmod{I^c}$.*

We begin with the definition of symplecticness of automorphism of local rings (which will be seen later to be compatible with that of K3 surfaces).

Definition 3.2. (1) Let $(C, \mathfrak{n})$ be a 2-dimensional normal local ring over a field k with isolated Gorenstein singularity (e.g. RDP) with $C/\mathfrak{n} \cong k$. Let $U = \mathrm{Spec}\, C \setminus \{\mathfrak{n}\}$. Then $\Omega^2_{C/k}|_U$ is trivial, and hence $H^0(U, \Omega^2_{C/k}) \cong$

$H^0(U, \mathcal{O}) = C$. We say that an automorphism or a group of automorphisms of C is *symplectic* if it acts on the 1-dimensional k-vector space $H^0(U, \Omega^2_{C/k}) \otimes_C C/\mathfrak{n}$ trivially.

(2) Let B be as in Theorem 1.3. We say that an automorphism of B is *symplectic* if the induced automorphism of $B \otimes k$ is so.

In some cases we can compute $\Omega^2_{C/k}|_U$ and the action on it explicitly: If C is as in Lemma 2.10, and g is an automorphism of C with $g(x_i) = a_i x_i$ and $g(F_j) = e_j F_j$ for some $a_i, e_j \in k^*$, then $g(\omega) = (\prod a_i / \prod e_j)\omega$, and in particular g is symplectic if and only if $\prod a_i = \prod e_j$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let C, U be as above, $X \to \operatorname{Spec} C$ the minimal resolution, and let $g \in \operatorname{Aut}(C)$ a nontrivial symplectic automorphism of finite order prime to $p = \operatorname{char} k$. Then g acts on X and $\operatorname{Fix}(g) \subset X$ is 0-dimensional (if nonempty).*

Proof. Let $x \in X$ be a fixed closed point. Since g is of finite order prime to p, the action of g on $T^*_{X,x}$ is semisimple (diagonalizable). By Lemma 2.11, this action has determinant 1 (since $\Omega^2_{X,x} \cong \det T^*_{X,x}$) and hence its eigenvalues are λ, λ^{-1}. Since $g \neq 1$ we have $\lambda, \lambda^{-1} \neq 1$. This implies x is isolated in $\operatorname{Fix}(g)$. □

Lemma 3.4. *(1) Let X_0 be an RDP K3 surface over a field k, $x \in X_0(k)$ an RDP (or a smooth point), and $G \subset \operatorname{Aut}(X_0)$ a subgroup fixing x. Let $\tilde{X}_0$ be the minimal resolution of X_0 (then we have natural injection $\operatorname{Aut}(X_0) \to \operatorname{Aut}(\tilde{X}_0)$). Then G is symplectic as a subgroup of $\operatorname{Aut}(\tilde{X}_0)$ if and only if it is symplectic as a subgroup of $\mathcal{O}_{X_0,x}$ in the above sense.*

(2) Let $\mathcal{O}_K$ be as above. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a proper RDP model of an RDP K3 surface X over K, $x \in \mathcal{X}(k)$ an RDP (or a smooth point) of $\mathcal{X}_0$, and $G \subset \operatorname{Aut}(\mathcal{X})$ a subgroup fixing x. Assume that G is finite and of order prime to $p = \operatorname{char} k$. Then G is symplectic as a subgroup of $\operatorname{Aut}(\tilde{X})$ if and only if it is symplectic as a subgroup of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}_0,x}$ in the above sense.

Proof. (1) Let $C = \mathcal{O}_{X_0,x}$ and define $\mathfrak{n}, U$ as above. Let ω be a nonzero element (hence a generator) of $H^0(\tilde{X}_0, \Omega^2)$. Then ω restricts to a generator of $H^0(U, \Omega^2_{C/k}) \otimes_C C/\mathfrak{n}$, hence the action of G on the two spaces coincide.

(2) Take a generator ω of $H^0(\mathcal{X} \setminus \Sigma, \Omega^2)$ (Lemma 2.12). The action of $G \subset \operatorname{Aut}(\mathcal{X})$ on $\omega|_{\tilde{X}}$ factors through $\mu_N(K)$ for some N prime to p. On the other hand $\omega|_{\mathcal{X}_0}$ restricts to a generator of $H^0(U, \Omega^2_{C/k}) \otimes_C C/\mathfrak{n}$, where $C = \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}_0,x}$. The action of G on the two spaces are compatible under the reduction map $\mu_N(K) \to \mu_N(k)$. This map is injective since N is prime to p. □

First we consider the symplectic case of Theorem 1.3 and we prove the following detailed version. We say that two pairs (G_i, B_i) $(i = 1, 2)$ of a finite group G_i and a local $\mathcal{O}_K$-algebra B_i equipped with a G_i-action are *étale-locally isomorphic* if there exists a pair (G_3, B_3), group isomorphisms

$G_i \xrightarrow{\sim} G_3$, and equivariant étale local morphisms $B_i \to B_3$ of local $\mathcal{O}_K$-algebras.

We define a *partial (simultaneous) resolution* of a local ring B as in Theorem 1.3 to be a proper morphism $f\colon X \to \operatorname{Spec} B$ from an algebraic space X such that, f is an isomorphism on the generic fiber, f is not an isomorphism on the special fiber, all singularity of X_0 are RDPs (if any), and the minimal resolution of X_0 is the minimal resolution of $\operatorname{Spec} B_0$ ($B_0 = B \otimes k$). It follows that X_0 has less RDPs than $\operatorname{Spec} B_0$ (A_n, D_n, E_n counted with weight n).

Proposition 3.5. *Let B and G be as in Theorem 1.3, and assume G is symplectic. Then,*

(1) the type of the singularity and the group G is one of the pairs listed below;

(2) except for the case (A_1), (G, B) is étale-locally isomorphic to the normal form (G', B') described below after replacing K by a finite extension; and

(3) B admits a G-equivariant simultaneous resolution after replacing K by a finite extension.

In each case below B' is $\mathcal{O}_K[x,y,z]^{\mathrm{h}}/(F)$ (unless stated otherwise), and q_l are some elements of the maximal ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of $\mathcal{O}_K$.

$(E_6, \mathfrak{S}_2)$ *F is one of the following, and the nontrivial element of $G' = \mathfrak{S}_2$ acts by $(x,y,z) \mapsto (-x,y,-z)$.*

- (E_6) *($p \neq 3$): $F = x^2 + y^3 + z^4 + q_{00} + q_{10}y + q_{02}z^2 + q_{12}yz^2$.*
- (E_6^0) *($p = 3$): $F = x^2 + y^3 + z^4 + q_{00} + q_{10}y + q_{20}y^2 + q_{02}z^2 + q_{12}yz^2 + q_{22}y^2z^2$.*
- (E_6^1) *($p = 3$): $F = x^2 + y^3 + y^2z^2 + z^4 + q_{00} + q_{10}y + q_{20}y^2 + q_{02}z^2$.*

$(D_m, \mathfrak{S}_2)$ *$m \geq 4$, $F = x^2 + yz^2 + y^{m-1} + \sum_{l=0}^{m-2} q_l y^l$, and the nontrivial element of $G' = \mathfrak{S}_2$ acts by $(x,y,z) \mapsto (-x,y,-z)$.*

$(D_4, \mathfrak{S}_3)$, $(D_4, \mathfrak{A}_3)$ *F is one of the following, G' is either $\mathfrak{S}_3$ or $\mathfrak{A}_3$, and $G' \subset \mathfrak{S}_3$ acts by $(123)(x,y,z) = (x, \zeta_3 y, \zeta_3^{-1} z)$, $(12)(x,y,z) = (-x,z,y)$.*

- (D_4) *($p \neq 2$): $F = x^2 + y^3 + z^3 + q_{000} + q_{011}xyz$.*
- (D_4^0) *($p = 2$): $F = x^2 + y^3 + z^3 + q_{000} + q_{100}x + q_{011}yz + q_{111}xyz$.*
- (D_4^1) *($p = 2$): $F = x^2 + y^3 + z^3 + xyz + q_{000} + q_{100}x$.*

  We also have an alternative form: $B' = \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_K[x, y_1, y_2, y_3]^{\mathrm{h}}/(F_1, F_2)$, $F_1 = y_1y_2y_3 + Q(x)$, $F_2 = y_1 + y_2 + y_3 - R(x)$, where $Q(x), R(x) \in \mathcal{O}_K[x]$ are polynomials of the following form with $q_l', r_l' \in \mathfrak{p}$, and $G' \subset \mathfrak{S}_3$ acts by $\rho(x) = \operatorname{sgn}(\rho)x, \rho(y_i) = y_{\rho(i)}$.

- (D_4) *($p \neq 2$): $Q(x) = x^2 + q_0'$, $R(x) = r_0'$.*
- (D_4^0) *($p = 2$): $Q(x) = x^2 + \sum_{l=0}^{3} q_l' x^l$, $R(x) = \sum_{l=0}^{1} r_l' x^l$.*
- (D_4^1) *($p = 2$): $Q(x) = x^3 + x^2 + \sum_{l=0}^{3} q_l' x^l$, $R(x) = x + \sum_{l=0}^{1} r_l' x^l$.*

(A_m, Dih_n) *$m \geq 3$ odd, n any integer, $F = xy + z^{m+1} + \sum_{l=0}^{m} q_l z^l$, $q_l = 0$ if l odd, $G' = \mathrm{Dih}_n$ acting by $\sigma(x,y,z) = (\zeta_n x, \zeta_n^{-1} y, z)$ and $\tau(x,y,z) = (y,x,-z)$.*

(A_m, Dic_n) *$m \geq 2$ even, n an even integer, $F = xy+z^{m+1}+\sum_{l=0}^{m} q_l z^l$, $q_l = 0$ if l even, $G' = \mathrm{Dic}_n$ acting by $\sigma(x,y,z) = (\zeta_n x, \zeta_n^{-1} y, z)$ and $\tau(x,y,z) = (y,-x,-z)$.*

(A_m, C_n) *$m \geq 2$, n any integer, $F = xy + z^{m+1} + \sum_{l=0}^{m} q_l z^l$, $q_m = 0$ if p does not divide $m+1$, $G' = C_n$ is the cyclic group of order n with generator σ acting by $\sigma(x,y,z) = (\zeta_n x, \zeta_n^{-1} y, z)$.*

(A_1) *The singularity is of type A_1.*

Here ζ_n is a primitive n-th root of unity and

$$\mathrm{Dih}_n = \langle \sigma, \tau \mid \sigma^n = \tau^2 = \tau\sigma\tau^{-1}\sigma = 1 \rangle,$$

$$\mathrm{Dic}_n = \langle \sigma, \tau \mid \sigma^n = \sigma^{n/2}\tau^2 = \tau\sigma\tau^{-1}\sigma = 1 \rangle$$

are respectively the dihedral and dicyclic groups (of order $2n$).

Remark 3.6. E_6^0, E_6^1 (in $p = 3$) and D_4^0, D_4^1 (in $p = 2$) are analytically non-isomorphic RDPs having the same Dynkin diagrams. See [Art77] for the classification and notation.

The only non-routine part of the proof of this proposition is finding the suitable formula for equivariant resolution.

We do not give a description of G and F in the case (A_1) since our proof of Theorem 1.3 does not need one. Any finite subgroup of SO(3) of order prime to p can occur as G.

Except for the case (A_1), the number of parameters q_l in each case (excluding those indicated to be 0) is exactly the relative dimension of the deformation space of the singularity equipped with the action.

Shepherd-Barron has recently announced that the set of (not necessarily equivariant) simultaneous resolution of a deformation of an RDP is a torsor of the Weyl group and in particular they have the same cardinality (this was known in complex case by Brieskorn [Bri68],[Bri71]). Using this, we might be able to prove this proposition by computing the G-action on this set and finding a fixed element.

It is likely that, under the assumption of good reduction (i.e. existence of simultaneous resolution that is not necessarily G-equivariant), there exists a simultaneous G-equivariant resolution without extending K. We do not pursue this.

In this paper the completeness of $\mathcal{O}_K$ is used only in the proof of (2), where we make coordinate change to simplify the equation. Maybe we can prove it in a more clever way assuming $\mathcal{O}_K$ to be only Henselian.

Before proving Proposition 3.5 we prove the following version (which is completely routine).

Proposition 3.7. *Let k be a perfect field of characteristic $p \geq 0$. Let C be a flat local k-algebra of relative dimension 2 obtained as the localization of a finite type k-algebra at a maximal ideal, with RDP singularity. Let G be a nontrivial finite group of order prime to p acting on C symplectically and faithfully. Then,*

(1) the type of the singularity and the group G is one of the pairs in the list of Proposition 3.5; and

(2) except for the case (A_1), (G, C) is étale-locally isomorphic to $(G', B' \otimes k)$ (so all of q_l, q'_l, r'_l are 0) for one of (G', B') in the list, after replacing k by a finite extension.

Remark 3.8. If $p = 0$, the list in (1) can be obtained without any computation. For simplicity replace C with its Henselization. It is known that C admits a unique finite connected covering $\operatorname{Spec}\tilde{C} \to \operatorname{Spec} C$ that is étale outside the closed point, and that this covering is Galois ($\operatorname{Spec}\tilde{C}$ can be obtained as the normalization of $\operatorname{Spec} C$ in the universal cover of $\operatorname{Spec} C \setminus \{\mathfrak{n}\}$). Since G is symplectic, the quotient $(\operatorname{Spec} C)/G = \operatorname{Spec}(C^G)$ is also an RDP and admits a covering of the same type, which by uniqueness coincides with $\operatorname{Spec}\tilde{C}$. It follows that $N = \operatorname{Gal}(\tilde{C}/C)$ and G fits into an exact sequence $1 \to N \to H \to G \to 1$ of groups where H is a finite subgroup of $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$. Using the well-known description of the group corresponding to each RDP, we obtain the following list, which of course is equivalent to that in the proposition.

N	H	G	C	C^G
$\widetilde{T}$	$\widetilde{O}$	$\mathfrak{S}_2$	E_6	E_7
$\widetilde{\mathrm{Dih}}_{m-2}$	$\widetilde{\mathrm{Dih}}_{2m-4}$	$\mathfrak{S}_2$	D_m	D_{2m-2}
$\widetilde{\mathrm{Dih}}_2$	$\widetilde{O}$	$\mathfrak{S}_3$	D_4	E_7
$\widetilde{\mathrm{Dih}}_2$	$\widetilde{T}$	$\mathfrak{A}_3$	D_4	E_6
C_{m+1}	$\widetilde{\mathrm{Dih}}_{n(m+1)/2}$	(*)	A_m	$D_{n(m+1)/2+2}$
C_{m+1}	$C_{n(m+1)}$	C_n	A_m	$A_{n(m+1)-1}$
$\{\pm 1\}$	H	$H/\{\pm 1\}$	A_1	$(\mathbb{A}^2/H)$

(*) is Dih_n or Dic_n respectively if m is odd or even.

Here C_n, $\widetilde{\mathrm{Dih}}_n$ $(= \mathrm{Dic}_{2n})$, $\widetilde{T}, \widetilde{O}, \widetilde{I}$ are respectively the cyclic group, the binary dihedral group (of order $4n$), the binary tetrahedral, the binary octahedral, and the binary icosahedral group, corresponding to RDPs of type A_{n-1}, D_{n+2}, E_6, E_7, E_8. In the last line H is any finite subgroup of $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$ containing $\{\pm 1\}$.

If p does not divide the order of N then the same argument applies.

Proof. We first show the following claim: the type of the singularity cannot be E_7 or E_8; if it is E_6 or D_m $(m \geq 5)$, then G is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{S}_2$ (and hence $p \neq 2$); if it is D_4, then G injects to $\mathfrak{S}_3$. To see this, assume that the type is one of these, take $g \in G$ and consider the induced automorphism $g|_E$ on the exceptional divisor E of the minimal resolution $X \to \operatorname{Spec} C$. If g is nontrivial then $g|_E$ is also nontrivial and its fixed points are isolated by Lemma 3.3. Let Γ be the unique component of E intersecting with three other components. Since no nontrivial automorphism of $\mathbb{P}^1$ fixes three points, this gives an injection $G \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{S}_3$. Furthermore, the symmetry of E (or of the Dynkin diagram) tells us that if the type is E_7 or E_8 (resp. E_6 or

D_m ($m \geq 5$)) then G injects to $\mathfrak{S}_1$ (resp. $\mathfrak{S}_2$). Since we assume $G \neq 1$ the claim follows.

We may replace C by Henselization and we may assume it is of the form $k[x,y,z]^{\mathrm{h}}/(F)$, $F \in (x_1,x_2,x_3)^2$, $F \notin (x_1,x_2,x_3)^3$ ([Lip69, Lemma 23.4]), and we may assume k is algebraically closed.

(Case E_6): By above we have $p \neq 2$. Consider a nontrivial element $g \in G$. Since the order n of g is prime to p, the action of g on $\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2$ is diagonalizable. We may assume $F \equiv x^2 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}^3}$. Since we assume G is prime to p, we can linearize the action of g on x so that we may assume $g(x) = ax$ for some $a \in k^*$ (indeed, we may assume $g(x) \equiv ax \pmod{\mathfrak{m}^2}$ for some n-th root of 1 and we replace x with $(\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} g^i(x)/a^i)^{1/n}$). We have that $F \bmod (\mathfrak{m}^4 + (x))$ is a cube, and we may assume $F \equiv x^2 + xf_2 + y^3 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}^4}$ for some $f_2 \in \mathfrak{m}^2$. We can linearize g on y ($g(y) = by$). By computing $g(F) \bmod \mathfrak{m}^4$ we conclude $g(f_2) \equiv af_2 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}^3}$. Replacing x by $x + f_2/2$ and then linearizing x again we may assume $F \equiv x^2 + y^3 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}^4}$. We have that $F \bmod (\mathfrak{m}^5 + (x,y))$ is nonzero, and we may assume $F \equiv x^2 + y^3 + xf_3 + yf_3' + z^4 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}^5}$ for some $f_3, f_3' \in \mathfrak{m}^3$. We can linearize z ($g(z) = cz$). We have $g(F) = eF$ for some $e \in k^*$. We have $a^2 = b^3 = c^4 = e$. Since g is symplectic we also have $abc/e = 1$. The only nontrivial solution of this equation is $(a,b,c,e) = (-1,1,-1,1)$. We conclude that the only possible (nontrivial) G is $\mathfrak{S}_2$ acting this way.

Next we simplify F. We first show that we may assume $F - x^2 \in k[y,z]^{\mathrm{h}}$. The morphism $k[y,z]^{\mathrm{h}} \to k[x,y,z]^{\mathrm{h}}/(F_x)$ is étale since $F_x \equiv 2x \pmod{\mathfrak{m}}$ (and $p \neq 2$), and hence is an isomorphism. Let $x_0 \in k[y,z]^{\mathrm{h}}$ be the inverse image of x. Then $F_x|_{x=x_0} = 0$. This implies $F_{x'}|_{x'=0} = 0$ with respect to the coordinate x', y, z, where $x' = x - x_0$. So we can write $F = ux'^2 + J(y,z)$ with $u \in (k[x,y,z]^{\mathrm{h}})^*$ and $J \in k[y,z]^{\mathrm{h}}$. Letting $x'' = u^{1/2}x'$ we have $F = x''^2 + J$ as desired. Since F is g-invariant we still have $g(x'') = -x''$, and we have $J \in k[y,z^2]^{\mathrm{h}}$. By the same argument we obtain $J = v'(z^2 - g(y))^2 - h(y)$ for some $g, h \in k[y]^{\mathrm{h}}$ and $v' \in (k[y,z]^{\mathrm{h}})^*$. So we have $J = uy^3 + vz^4 + \sum_{i=0,1,2}\sum_{j=0,2} r_{ij}y^iz^j$ for some $u, v \in (k[y,z]^{\mathrm{h}})^*$ and $r_{ij} \in k$. Since the singularity is E_6 we have $r_{ij} = 0$ except for $(i,j) = (2,2)$. We may assume the constant terms of u and v are 1.

Assume $p \neq 3$. Then by replacing y with $y + (r_{22}/3)z^2$ we may assume $r_{22} = 0$, and then by replacing y, z by $u^{1/3}y, v^{1/4}z$ we have the desired form.

Assume $p = 3$. If $r_{22} = 0$ then we have $u^{-1}J = y^3 + ((u^{-1}v)^{1/4}z)^4$ as desired (this is the E_6^0 case). The other case of $r_{22} \neq 0$ (this is the E_6^1 case) is more complicated. We may assume $r_{22} = 1$. We will find $s, t \in (k[y,z^2]^{\mathrm{h}})^*$ such that $s^{-1}J = y^3 + (tz)^4 + y^2(tz)^2$. By Lemma 3.1 it suffices to find such s, t in $k[[y,z^2]]^*$. Start from $J = y^3 + z^4 + y^2z^2 + \sum_{(j,k)\in S} r_{jk}y^jz^k$, where $S = \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \times 2\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \setminus \{(0,0),(1,0),(2,0),(3,0),(0,2),(1,2),(2,2),(0,4)\}$. Define a total order $\leq$ on S by $(j,k) \leq (j',k')$ if and only if either $j + k < j' + k'$ or ($j + k = j' + k'$ and $j \leq j'$). Then this ordered set is well-ordered (in fact

isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$). For each $\lambda = (j,k) \in S$, if we have $r_\mu = 0$ for all $\mu < \lambda$, then by either

- replacing J by a unit multiple (if $j \geq 3$), or
- replacing z by a unit multiple ($k \geq 4$),

we can assume $r_\mu = 0$ for all $\mu \leq \lambda$. Repeating this and taking the limit we obtain units $s, t \in k[[y, z^2]]^*$ with the desired formula.

(Case D_m, $m \geq 5$): Again $p \neq 2$. Again consider a nontrivial element $g \in G$. As above, we may assume $F \equiv x^2 + yz^2 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}^4}$ and that g acts on x, y, z linearly. As above, we obtain $(a, b, c, e) = (a, 1, a, a^2)$. If $a^2 \neq 1$, then $F \in (x, z)^2$, which means that $(x = z = 0)$ is a 1-dimensional singularity, which is absurd. So we have $a^2 = 1$, hence $a = -1$. In particular we have $G = \mathfrak{S}_2$. As above, we may assume $F = x^2 + J(y, z)$ with $J(y, z) \in k[y, z^2]^{\mathrm{h}}$ and that $J(y, z^2) \equiv yz^2 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}^4}$. There exists a non-unit $L(z) \in k[[z^2]]$ such that $y' := y - L(z)$ divides J. Then replacing z we have $F = x^2 + y'(u_1 z^2 + u_2 y'^{m-2})$ for some $u_1, u_2 \in (k[[y, z^2]])^*$. Letting $x' := u_2^{-1/2} x$ and $z' := (u_1 u_2^{-1})^{1/2} z$, we have $u_2^{-1} F = x'^2 + y'(z'^2 + y'^{m-2})$. Applying Lemma 3.1 (to $k[y, z^2]^{\mathrm{h}}$), we may assume $y', z', u_2 \in k[y, z^2]^{\mathrm{h}}$ with the desired action.

(Case D_4, $p \neq 2$): As above, we may assume $F = x^2 + J(y, z)$ with $J \in \mathcal{O}_K[y, z]^{\mathrm{h}}$, $J \equiv \prod_{i=1}^{3} (s_i y + t_i z) \pmod{\mathfrak{m}^4}$, $s_i, t_i \in k$, $g(x) = ax$, and g permutes the set $\{(s_i y + t_i z)k\}_i$ of 1-dimensional subspaces in $\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2$. Write $\{g(s_i y + t_i z)\} = \{b_i(s_i y + t_i z)\}$. We may assume $\sum s_i = \sum t_i = 0$, and then we have $b_1 = b_2 = b_3 =: b$. Solving $a^2 = b^3 = \varepsilon a b^2$, where ε is the signature of the permutation, we obtain $(a, b) = (\varepsilon, 1)$ and that G injects to $\mathfrak{S}_3$. If G is of order 2, we can argue as in the previous case. Otherwise G is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{S}_3$ or $\mathfrak{A}_3$. Then by assumption we have $p \neq 3$. By diagonalizing and linearizing the action of $\mathfrak{A}_3 \subset G$ we may assume $F = x^2 + u_1 y^3 + u_2 z^3 + q_4 y^2 z^2$ with $(123)y = \zeta_3 y$ and $(123)z = \zeta_3^{-1} z$ for $u_1, u_2 \in (k[y, z]^{\mathrm{h}})^*$ and $q_4 \in k$. If $G = \mathfrak{S}_3$, then we may assume $(12)y = z$, and that $u_1 = (12)u_2$. We may assume $u_1 + u_2$ is a unit. We may assume $q_4 = 0$ by replacing y, z by y_1, z_1 with $y = y_1 + b z_1^2$ and $z = z_1 + b y_1^2$, where $b \in k$ satisfies $q_4 - 3b(u_1 + u_2)_0 = 0$, where $(u_1 + u_2)_0$ is the constant term. Then letting $y' = u_1^{1/3} y$ and $z' = u_2^{1/3} z$ we have $F = x^2 + y'^3 + z'^3$ as desired. Letting $y_i = \zeta_3^i y + \zeta_3^{-i} z$ $(i = 1, 2, 3)$ we have $y_1 + y_2 + y_3 = 0$, $F = x^2 + y_1 y_2 y_3$, and $\rho(y_i) = y_{\rho(i)}$, the alternative form.

(Case D_4, $p = 2$): Take a nontrivial $g \in G$. We may assume $g(x, y, z) = (ax, by, cz)$ and $g(F) = eF$. We may assume $F \equiv x^2 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}^3}$. We may assume $F \equiv x^2 + x f_2 + f_3 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}^4}$ where f_d are homogeneous degree d polynomials of y, z. We have $f_3 \neq 0$, since otherwise the blow-up at the origin has 1-dimensional singularity, which contradicts the property of RDPs. If $f_2 = y^2$ there exists no nontrivial (a, b, c). Hence we may assume either (D_4^0) $f_2 = 0$ or (D_4^1) $f_2 = yz$. Write $f_3 = \sum s_{jk} y^j z^k$.

Case (D_4^0): If f_3 has a square factor, then the blow-up at the origin has singularity that is not an RDP of type A_m, which contradicts the property of D_4. So f_3 is the product of three distinct linear factors. Hence at least two of s_{jk} are nonzero. A nontrivial solution (a,b,c) exists only if $s_{12}=s_{21}=0, s_{03}\neq 0, s_{30}\neq 0$, and then $(a,b,c)=(1,b,b^2)$ with $b^3=1$. Replacing J,y,z by unit multiples we may assume $J=x^2+y^3+z^3$. The alternative form can be obtained in the same way.

Case (D_4^1): If $s_{12}\neq 0$, then we have $a^2=abc=bc^2$, hence $(a,b,c,e)=(a,1,a,a^2)$, $a\neq 1$, but then $a^2\neq 1$, and then we have contradiction as in the case of D_m $(m\geq 5)$. Hence $s_{12}=0$ and similarly $s_{21}=0$. If $s_{03}=0$, then the blow-up at the origin has singularity that is not an RDP of type A_m, which contradicts the property of D_4. Hence $s_{03}\neq 0$ and similarly $s_{30}\neq 0$. Then by solving $a^2=abc=b^3=c^3$ we have $(a,b,c)=(1,b,b^2)$ with $b^3=1$. Hence G is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{A}_3$, with the desired action. We may assume $F\equiv x^2+xyz+y^3+z^3 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}^4}$. We use an argument similar to the E_6^1 case to reduce to the form $F=x^2+xyz+y^3+z^3$. Start from $J=x^2+xyz+y^3+z^3+\sum_{(i,j,k)\in S} r_{ijk}x^iy^jz^k$, where $S=\{(i,j,k)\in\mathbb{Z}^3_{\geq 0}\mid j-k\in 3\mathbb{Z}\}\setminus\{(0,0,0),(1,0,0),(2,0,0),(0,1,1),(1,1,1),(0,3,0),(0,0,3)\}$. Take a total order $\leq$ on S such that $(i,j,k)<(i',j',k')$ when $i+j+k<i'+j'+k'$ or $(i+j+k=i'+j'+k'$ and $i<i')$. At each step we either

- replace F by a unit multiple $(i\geq 2)$,
- replace y by $y+(r_{i22}/3)x^iz^2$ $(j=k=2)$,
- replace y by a unit multiple $(j\geq 3)$, or
- replace z by a unit multiple $(k\geq 3)$,

to assume $r_\lambda=0$ without violating $r_\mu=0$ $(\mu<\lambda)$. Repeating this and taking the limit we obtain a unit $t\in k[[x,y,z]]^*$ and elements $Y,Z\in k[[x,y,z]]$, with $g(t)=t$ and $g(Y,Z)=(bY,b^2Z)$, such that $t^{-1}F=x^2+xYZ+Y^3+Z^3$. Applying Lemma 3.1 directly, we obtain a solution (t,X,Y) in $k[x,y,z]^{\mathrm{h}}$ but possibly with a wrong g-action. Instead, we write $Y=Ay+Bz^2$ and $Z=Cz+Dy^2$ with $A,B,C,D\in k[[x,y^3,yz,z^3]]$, then apply the lemma to $k[x,y^3,yz,z^3]^{\mathrm{h}}$ and obtain $t,A,B,C,D\in k[x,y^3,yz,z^3]^{\mathrm{h}}=(k[x,y,z]^{\mathrm{h}})^G$. Then Y,Z defined by the formula above and t have the desired g-action. For the alternative form we set $y_i=\zeta_3^iy+\zeta_3^{-i}z-\frac{1}{3}x$.

(Case A_m, $m\geq 2$) We may assume $F\equiv xy \pmod{\mathfrak{m}^3}$. Each element of G either fixes the 1-dimensional subspaces kx and ky of $\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2$ or swap them. Let $G_0\subset G$ be the subgroup of the elements of the former type. We may also assume G fixes kz. Let $g\in G_0$ act by $g(x,y,z)=(ax,by,cz)$ and $g(F)=eF$. Solving $ab=e=abc$ we obtain $c=1$. Let $g\in G\setminus G_0$ act by $g(x,y,z)=(a'y,b'x,c'z)$ and $g(F)=e'F$. Solving $a'b'=e'=-a'b'c'$ we obtain $c'=-1$.

Write $F=xy+\sum_{i,j}a_{ij}(z)x^iy^j$, where $a_{ij}(z)\in\mathcal{O}_K[z]^{\mathrm{h}}$. Let x_0,y_0 be the inverse images of x,y by the étale (iso)morphism $k[z]^{\mathrm{h}}\to k[x,y,z]^{\mathrm{h}}/(F_x,F_y)$. letting $x'=x-x_0$ and $y'=y-y_0$, we have $F_{x'}|_{x'=y'=0}=F_{y'}|_{x'=y'=0}=0$,

that is, $a_{10} = a_{01} = 0$. This coordinate change is G-equivariant since the morphism $k[z]^{\mathrm{h}} \to k[x,y,z]^{\mathrm{h}}/(F_x, F_y)$ is so. Then the coefficient of z^{m+1} of a_{00} is nonzero and it follows that $e = 1$, $e' = (-1)^{m+1}$, and G is one of $C_n, \mathrm{Dih}_n, \mathrm{Dic}_n$ with the desired action. Next replace x and y with $x + b_{02}y$ and $y + b_{20}x$ for appropriate $b_{02}, b_{20} \in k[z]^{\mathrm{h}}$ to obtain $a_{20} = a_{02} = 0$. This coordinate change is G-equivariant.

We see that there exists $X, Y \in k[[x,y,z]]$ such that $F = a_{00} + XY$. Indeed, by replacing $X = x$ and $Y = y$ by $X + a_{0i}Y^{i-1}$ and $Y + a_{i0}X^{i-1}$ we may assume $a_{0i} = a_{i0} = 0$ inductively, so we obtain $X, Y \in k[[x,y,z]]$ such that $F = a_{00} + uXY$ with a G-invariant $u \in k[[x,y,z]]^*$, and then we replace X, Y by $u^{1/2}X, u^{1/2}Y$ (if $p \neq 2$) or by uX, Y (if $G = C_n$). By Lemma 3.1 we can take $X, Y \in k[x,y,z]^{\mathrm{h}}$. The action of G on X, Y may not be the desired one, but we still have that $g(X)$ differs by a unit from X or Y for each $g \in G$, since $g(X)g(Y) = XY$ and $k[x,y,z]^{\mathrm{h}}$ is a UFD. So by taking a suitable geometric mean we may assume that the G-action is the desired one. Finally we write $a_{00} = vz^{m+1}$, $v \in k[z]^{\mathrm{h}}$, and replace X, Y by $v^{1/2}X, v^{1/2}Y$ or by vX, Y so we have $v^{-1}F = z^{m+1} + XY$.

(Case A_1) We have nothing to prove. □

Proof of Proposition 3.5. (1) This is immediate from Proposition 3.7(1), since a nontrivial automorphism of B of finite order prime to p induces a nontrivial automorphism on $B \otimes k$ (indeed, if the induced automorphism is trivial, then applying Maschke's theorem to $B \to B \otimes k$ we obtain G-invariant elements generating $\mathfrak{m}$, and then G acts trivially on the completion $\hat{B}$ at $\mathfrak{m}$ and hence on B itself, a contradiction).

(2) Using Proposition 3.7(2), we can assume that $B = \mathcal{O}_K[x,y,z]^{\mathrm{h}}/(F)$ and that the action on x, y, z and the mod $\mathfrak{p}$ reduction $\overline{F}$ of F are of the desired form. It remains to simplify F. In the case of A_m we can argue as in Proposition 3.7, use at the final step the Weierstrass preparation theorem, and then if p does not divide $m+1$ replace z with $z + q_m/(m+1)$. The other cases are more complicated.

(Case $(D_m, \mathfrak{S}_2)$, $m \geq 4$) As in the previous proposition, we can write $F = x^2 + J(y,z)$, $J \in k[y,z^2]^{\mathrm{h}}$. We can find $q_0 \in \mathfrak{p}$ and a non-unit $L(z) \in \mathcal{O}_K[[z^2]]$ such that $y' = y - L(z)$ divides $J - q_0$. Then we have $F = x^2 + q_0 + y'(u_1 z^2 + M(y'))$ with $u_1 \in \mathcal{O}_K[[y', z^2]]^*$, $M(y') \in \mathcal{O}_K[[y']]$, and $M(y') \equiv y'^{m-2} \pmod{(\mathfrak{p} + (y'^{m-1}))}$. We can write $q_0 + y'M(y') = u_2 N(y')$ with a monic polynomial $N(y') \in \mathcal{O}_K[y']$ of degree $m-1$ and a unit $u_2 \in \mathcal{O}_K[[y']]^*$. So we have $F = x^2 + u_1 y' z^2 + u_2 N(y')$. Using Lemma 3.1 we may assume $u_1, u_2, y' \in \mathcal{O}_K[y, z^2]^{\mathrm{h}}$. Letting $x' = u_2^{-1/2}x$ and $z' = u_1^{1/2}u_2^{-1/2}z$ we have $u_2^{-1}F = x'^2 + y'z'^2 + N(y')$.

(Case $(D_4, \mathfrak{S}_3)$ and $(D_4, \mathfrak{A}_3)$, $p \neq 2$) As in the previous case we can write $F = x^2 + J(y,z)$ with a G-invariant $J \in \mathcal{O}_K[y,z]^{\mathrm{h}}$ with $J \equiv y^3 + z^3 \pmod{(\mathfrak{p} + \mathfrak{m}^4)}$ and $(123)(y,z) = (\zeta y, \zeta^{-1}z), (12)(y,z) = (z,y)$. We will find a coordinate for which $J = y^3 + z^3 + r_{00} + r_{11}yz$. To achieve this,

we argue as in the case E_6^1 and D_4^1 of the proof of Proposition 3.7. Write $J = y^3 + z^3 + \sum_{(j,k)\in S} r_{jk} y^j z^k$, $r_{jk} \in \mathcal{O}_K$ and $r_{00}, r_{11}, r_{30}, r_{03} \in \mathfrak{p}$, where $S = \{(j,k) \in \mathbb{Z}^2_{\geq 0} \mid j - k \in 3\mathbb{Z}\}$. Let $\tilde{S} = \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \times (S \setminus \{(0,0),(1,1)\})$, and for each $\lambda = (h,j,k) \in \tilde{S}$ define the statement $T(\lambda)$ to be "$|r_{jk}| \leq |r_{11}|^h$". Assume for a moment that $G = \mathfrak{A}_3$. Take a total order $\leq$ on $\tilde{S}$ such that $(h,j,k) < (h',j',k')$ when $h+j+k < h'+j'+k'$ or ($h+j+k = h'+j'+k'$ and $h < h'$). For each $\lambda = (h,j,k) \in \tilde{S}$, if we have $T(\mu)$ for all $\mu < \lambda$, then we either

- replace y by $y + (r_{22}/3)z^2$ (if $j = k = 2$),
- replace y by a unit multiple ($j \geq 3$), or
- replace z by a unit multiple ($k \geq 3$),

to assume $T(\mu)$ for all $\mu \leq \lambda$. Note that this does not change r_{11}. As in the D_4^1 case of Proposition 3.7 we obtain coordinates with the desired formula and G-action. Now consider the case $G = \mathfrak{S}_3$ (we have $r_{jk} = r_{kj}$). This time we take a total order $\leq$ on the set $\tilde{S}/\mathfrak{S}_2$ (the nontrivial element of $\mathfrak{S}_2$ acting by $(h,j,k) \mapsto (h,k,j)$) with the same conditions. At the $[\lambda]$-th step ($\lambda \in \tilde{S}$), i.e. if we have $T(\mu)$ for all $\mu \in \tilde{S}$ with $[\mu] < [\lambda]$, we either

- replace y, z by $y + (r_{22}/6)z^2, z + (r_{22}/6)y^2$ (if $j = k = 2$), or
- replace y, z by $uy, ((12)u)z$ (otherwise),

to assume $T(\mu)$ for all μ with $[\mu] \leq [\lambda]$. By the same argument we have $y', z' \in \mathcal{O}_K[[y,z]]$, with the desired formula. Writing $y' = (A + B(y^3 - z^3))y + (C + D(y^3 - z^3))z^2$, $z' = (A - B(y^3 - z^3))z + (C - D(y^3 - z^3))y^2$, with $A, B, C, D \in \mathcal{O}_K[[y^3 + z^3, yz]] = \mathcal{O}_K[[y,z]]^G$, and applying Lemma 3.1 we obtain $A, B, C, D \in (\mathcal{O}_K[y,z]^{\mathrm{h}})^G$, hence $y', z' \in \mathcal{O}_K[y,z]^{\mathrm{h}}$, with the desired formula and action.

Letting $y_i = \zeta^i y + \zeta^{-i} z - \frac{1}{3} r_{11}$, $q_0 := r_{00} + \frac{1}{27} r_{11}^3$, and $q_2 := -r_{11}$, we have $J = y_1 y_2 y_3 + q_0$, $y_1 + y_2 + y_3 - q_2 = 0$ and $\rho(y_i) = y_{\rho(i)}$, the alternative form.

(Case $(D_4, \mathfrak{A}_3)$, $p = 2$): We start from $F = x^2 + exyz + y^3 + z^3 + \sum_{(i,j,k)\in S} r_{ijk} x^i y^j z^k$ ($e = 0, 1$). Let $S = \{(i,j,k) \in \mathbb{Z}^3_{\geq 0} \mid j - k \in 3\mathbb{Z}\}$. Take a total order $\leq$ on $\tilde{S} = \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \times (S \setminus S_0)$,

$$S_0 = \{(0,0,0),(1,0,0),(2,0,0),(0,1,1),(1,1,1),(0,3,0),(0,0,3)\}.$$

Let $r^* \in \mathfrak{p}$ be an element with $\max\{|r_{000}|^{1/2}, |r_{100}|, |r_{011}|\} \leq |r^*| < 1$, and for each $\lambda = (h,i,j,k) \in \tilde{S}$ define the statement $T(\lambda)$ to be "$|r_{ijk}| \leq |r^*|^h$". Take a total order $\leq$ on $\tilde{S}$ such that $(h,i,j,k) < (h',i',j',k')$ when $h+i+j+k < h'+i'+j'+k'$ or ($h+i+j+k = h'+i'+j'+k'$ and $h < h'$) or ($h+i+j+k = h'+i'+j'+k'$ and $h = h'$ and $i < i'$). We use same coordinate change as in the D_4^1 in Proposition 3.7 (this does not change $\max\{|r_{000}|^{1/2}, |r_{100}|, |r_{011}|\}$). The alternative form can be obtained in the same way.

(Case $(E_6, \mathfrak{S}_2)$): As above, we may assume $F = x^2 + J(y,z)$ and we write $J = uy^3 + vz^4 + q_{00} + q_{10}y + q_{20}y^2 + q_{02}z^2 + q_{12}yz^2 + q_{22}y^2z^2$ with units

$u, v \in (\mathcal{O}_K[y,z]^{\mathrm{h}})^*$, and coefficients q_{ij} in $\mathfrak{p}$ except possibly for q_{22}. We may assume the constant terms of u and v are 1 (if $p = 3$, this involves multiplying F and x by units in $\mathcal{O}_K^*$). First assume $p \neq 3$. We let $y = y_1 + b + cz_1^2$ and $z = z_1$ for $b = -q_{20}/3$ and $c = -q_{22}/3$, and then let $y_2 = u_1^{1/3} y_1$ and $z_2 = v_1^{1/4} z_1$, and repeat this procedure. Then by taking the limit we obtain $y', z' \in \mathcal{O}_K[[y,z]]$, congruent to y, z modulo $(\mathfrak{p} + \mathfrak{m}^2)$, and $q'_{ij} \in \mathfrak{p}$ satisfying $J = y'^3 + z'^4 + q'_{00} + q'_{10}y' + q'_{02}z'^2 + q'_{12}y'z'^2$. By Lemma 3.1 we may assume $y', z' \in \mathcal{O}_K[y,z]^{\mathrm{h}}$ with the desired action.

Next assume $p = 3$. First assume $q_{22} \in \mathfrak{p}$ (so the singularity is E_6^0). We replace J, z by $u^{-1}J, u^{-1/4}v^{1/4}z$, and repeat. Next assume $q_{22} \notin \mathfrak{p}$ (so the singularity is E_6^1). We let $y = ay_1$ and $z = bz_1$ where $a = uvq_{22}^{-2}$ and $b = u^2 v q_{22}^{-3}$, then we have $uy^3 + vz^4 + q_{22}y^2z^2 = u^4v^3q_{22}^{-6}(y_1^3 + z_1^4 + y_1^2z_1^2)$. Hence $(u^4v^3q_{22}^6)^{-1}J = u_1y_1^3 + v_1z_1^4 + q'_{22}y_1^2z_1^2 + \sum q'_{ij}y_1^i z_1^j$. Next let $y_1 = y_2 + b$ and $z_1 = z_2$ with $b = -q_{12}/2$. Repeat this and argue as in the $p > 3$ case.

(3) We first show that it suffices to give a simultaneous G-resolution after an étale base change. Indeed, assume that $B \to B_1$ is a local étale G-equivariant homomorphism and $f\colon X \to \operatorname{Spec} B_1$ is a simultaneous G-resolution. By extending K we may assume that $B/\mathfrak{m} \to B_1/\mathfrak{m}_1$ is an isomorphism. Let $V = \operatorname{Spec} B$, $o \in V$ the closed point, and $V^* = V \setminus \{o\}$. Define V_1, o_1, V_1^* similarly. Write $R = V_1 \times_V V_1$, which is the étale equivalence relation on V_1 inducing $V = V_1/R$. Then we have $R = \Delta(V_1) \sqcup R^*$, where Δ is the diagonal, and $R^* \subset V_1^* \times_{V^*} V_1^*$. Now let $R' = \Delta(X) \sqcup f^*(R^*) \subset X \times_V X$. Here $f^*(R^*)$ is isomorphic to R^* since f is an isomorphism over V_1^*. Then R' is a étale equivalence relation on X and $X/R' \to V_1/R = V$ is a simultaneous G-resolution.

It remains to give a partial simultaneous G'-resolution of B' (except case (A_1)). For cases of A_m $(m \geq 1)$, we moreover construct a (not partial) simultaneous G-resolution.

(Case (A_m, C_n) $(m \geq 2)$): By replacing K by a finite extension, we obtain $F = xy + \prod_{i=1}^{m+1}(z - \alpha_i)$ for some $\alpha_i \in \mathfrak{p}$. (Since the generic fiber is smooth it follows that α_i's are distinct.) Let $I_j = (x, (z-\alpha_1)(z-\alpha_2)\cdots(z-\alpha_j))$ $(j = 1, \ldots, m)$. Then these ideals are G-invariant and the blow-up at the ideal $I = I_1 I_2 \cdots I_m$ is a simultaneous G-resolution.

(Cases (A_m, Dih_n) $(m \geq 3$ odd) and (A_m, Dic_n) $(m \geq 2$ even)): By replacing K by a finite extension, we obtain $F = xy + \prod_{i=1}^{m+1}(z - \alpha_i)$ for some $\alpha_i \in \mathfrak{p}$ satisfying $\alpha_{m+2-i} = -\alpha_i$ (hence $\alpha_{m/2+1} = 0$ if m even). Define I_j as in the previous case. Then, because of the identity $xy = \prod(z - \alpha_i)$, the blow-up at $\tau(I_j) = (y, (z-\alpha_{m+2-j})\cdots(z-\alpha_m)(z-\alpha_{m+1}))$ coincides with the blow-up at $I_{m+1-j} = (x, (z-\alpha_1)(z-\alpha_2)\cdots(z-\alpha_{m+1-j}))$. This shows that the blow-up at $I_j I_{m+1-j}$ is τ-equivariant (even if the ideal itself is not τ-stable). Likewise, the blow-up at $I = \prod I_j$ is τ-equivariant and hence is a simultaneous G-resolution.

(Case A_1): It suffices to give a simultaneous G-resolution of the Henselization B^{h} of B. The local Picard group $\mathrm{Cl}(B^{\mathrm{h}})$ of B^{h} is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}$. Let I_+ and I_- be ideals of Weil divisors that are the two generators of $\mathrm{Cl}(B^{\mathrm{h}})$. We will show that the blow-ups at $I_\pm$ are G-resolutions. To show this it suffices to check that it is a g-resolution for each nontrivial $g \in G$. Write $B^{\mathrm{h}} = \mathcal{O}_K[x,y,z]^{\mathrm{h}}/(F)$. We may assume $g(x,y,z) = (ax, by, cz)$. We may assume $ab = c = 1$. As in the case of A_m ($m \geq 2$), we may assume $F = xy + (z-\alpha_1)(z-\alpha_2)$ with $\alpha_i \in \mathfrak{p}$. Let $J_i = (x, z-\alpha_i)$. Then $[J_1], [J_2]$ are the two generators of $\mathrm{Cl}(B^{\mathrm{h}})$. Also, J_1, J_2 are g-invariant, and the blow-ups at J_i are simultaneous g-resolutions. Since this is true for all $g \in G$, the blow-ups at J_i are G-resolutions.

(Applying Shepherd-Barron's result (see Remark 3.6) to the case of A_1, it follows that there are no other resolution, so we have that *any* simultaneous resolution is G-equivariant.)

(Case $(D_m, \mathfrak{S}_2)$ ($m \geq 4$)): Write $y^{m-1} + \sum_{l=0}^{m-2} q_l y^l = -(A(y)^2 + yB(y)^2)$ with polynomials $A, B \in \mathcal{O}_K[y]$. (To find such A, B, we write $y^{m-1} + \sum q_l y^l = \prod(y + \beta_i^2)$, and write $\prod(\beta_i + \sqrt{-y}) = \sqrt{-1}(A + B\sqrt{-y})$ with $A, B \in \mathcal{O}_K[y]$). Then we have $F = (x+A)(x-A) + y(z+B)(z-B)$ and the ideal $I = (x+A, z+B)(x-A, z-B)$ is G-invariant. The blow-up at I is a partial G-resolution, whose special fiber having a single singularity, of type A_{m-2}.

(Cases $(D_4, \mathfrak{S}_3)$ and $(D_4, \mathfrak{A}_3)$) (p may be $= 2$): We use the alternative form.

Write $R(x) = r_1 x + r_0$. Write $Q(x) = (h_1 x + h_0)(a_1 x + a_0)(b_1 x + b_0)$ with $a_1, b_1, h_0 \in \mathcal{O}_K^*$, $a_0, b_0 \in \mathfrak{p}$, and $h_1 \in \mathcal{O}_K$. We have $a_1 b_0 - a_0 b_1 \neq 0$, since otherwise the generic fiber has singularity. Write $H(x) = h_1 x + h_0$. Take nonzero $\gamma, \delta \in \mathfrak{p}$ satisfying $\gamma b_j + \delta a_j + \gamma\delta r_j + (\gamma\delta)^2 h_j = 0$ for $j = 0, 1$: by the conditions on the coefficients we straightforwardly observe that such a solution exists. If $p \neq 2$ we have $r_1 = 0$ and assume $H(x) = 1$, $a_1 = b_1 = 1$, $a_0 = -b_0$, and then we have $\gamma = -\delta$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_1 = {} & H(x)(a_1 x + a_0 + \gamma y_i)(b_1 x + b_0 + \delta y_i) \\ & + y_i(y_{i+1} + \gamma\delta H(x))(y_{i+2} + \gamma\delta H(x)) + \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

in $\mathcal{O}_K[x, y_1, y_2, y_3]^{\mathrm{h}}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &= -H(x)y_i(((b_1 x + b_0)\gamma + (a_1 x + a_0)\delta + \gamma\delta R(x) + (\gamma\delta)^2 H(x)) + \gamma\delta F_2) \\ &= -\gamma\delta H(x) y_i F_2 \in (F_2). \end{aligned}$$

Let $I_i = (a_1 x + a_0 + \gamma y_{i-1}, y_i + \gamma\delta H(x)) \subset B$. Then we have $\rho(I_i) = I_{\rho(i)}$ for each $\rho \in G \subset \mathfrak{S}_3$. Indeed, clearly $(123)I_i = I_{i+1}$ and, if $G = \mathfrak{S}_3$ (in which

case $p \neq 2$), $(i, i+1)I_i = I_{i+1}$ follows from the equality

$$\begin{aligned} -a_1x + a_0 + \gamma y_{i-1} &= -(a_1x + a_0 + \gamma y_i) - \gamma(y_{i+1} + \gamma\delta H) \\ &\quad + \gamma F_2 + (2a_0 + \gamma^2\delta H + \gamma R) \\ &\equiv -(a_1x + a_0 + \gamma y_i) - \gamma(y_{i+1} + \gamma\delta H) \pmod{(F_2)} \end{aligned}$$

in $\mathcal{O}_K[x, y_1, y_2, y_3]^{\mathrm{h}}$, where $(2a_0+\gamma^2\delta H+\gamma R) = 0$ follows from the conditions on a_i, b_i, h_i, r_i and γ, δ. Hence the ideal $J = I_1I_2I_3$ is G-invariant. The blow-up at J is a partial G-resolution, whose special fiber having a single singularity, of type A_1.

(Case $(E_6, \mathfrak{S}_2)$) (p may be $= 3$): We can write $F = x^2 - (z^2 - H(y))^2 + 4T(y)$ with $H = \sum_{i=0}^{2} h_i y^i$ and $T = \sum_{i=0}^{4} t_i y^i$ with $h_0, h_1, t_0, t_1, t_2 \in \mathfrak{p}$, $t_3 \in \mathcal{O}_K^*$, $h_2, t_4 \in \mathcal{O}_K$. Take a decomposition $T = RS$ with $R, S \in \mathcal{O}_K[y]$ with $\deg R = \deg S = 2$, $\mathrm{ord}_y(R \bmod \mathfrak{p}) = 1$ and $\mathrm{ord}_y(S \bmod \mathfrak{p}) = 2$. Write $R = \sum_{i=0}^{2} r_i y^i$ and $S = \sum_{i=0}^{2} s_i y^i$. We find $A \in \mathcal{O}_K[y]$ (of degree ≤ 2), $b, c_0 \in \mathfrak{p}$ and $c_1 \in \mathcal{O}_K^*$ satisfying, letting $C(y) = c_1 y + c_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} H &= -A + 2b^2R \\ -H^2 + 4T &= -A^2 - 4RC^2 \end{aligned}$$

so that $F = (x + z^2 + A)(x - z^2 - A) + 4R(bz + C)(bz - C)$. Then the blowup at the (G-invariant) ideal $(x + z^2 + A, bz + C)(x - z^2 - A, bz - C)$ is a partial simultaneous G-resolution (with one remaining singularity, of type $(D_4, \mathfrak{S}_2)$). By eliminating A, we need $b^4R - b^2H + S = -C^2$. For the left hand side to be a square we need

$$(r_1b^4 - h_1b^2 + s_1)^2 - (r_0b^4 - h_0b^2 + s_0)(r_2b^4 - h_2b^2 + s_2) = 0,$$

which indeed has solution b in $\mathfrak{p}$ since $h_0, h_1, r_0, s_0, s_1 \in \mathfrak{p}$ and $r_1 \in \mathcal{O}_K^*$. □

Proof of Theorem 1.3. If G is symplectic then this follows from Proposition 3.5(3) inductively (unless $G = 1$, in which case we use [Art74, Theorem 2]).

Now assume G is non-symplectic. We may assume that G is cyclic with generator g.

First we reduce to the special case of A_1 or A_2 and G acting on the exceptional curves transitively. Assume we have a G-resolution $\pi\colon \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X}'$ and let E be the exceptional divisor. Then, by the shape of the Dynkin diagram, the set of components of E has a G-orbit O consisting of one or two elements. Then π factors through a G-equivariant morphism $\pi''\colon \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X}''$ that contracts exactly components in O (as in the proof of [LM15, Proposition 3.1]). Such π'', which gives a G-equivariant simultaneous resolution of $\mathcal{X}''$, cannot exist according to the special case.

Consider the special case. Assume $\pi\colon \mathcal{X} \to \operatorname{Spec} B$ is a G-resolution. Let $E_1, \ldots, E_m$ be the exceptional curves ($m = 1, 2$). Then π induces a G-equivariant homomorphism $(R^1\pi_*\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}^*)_{\bar{x}} \to \mathrm{Cl}(B^{\mathrm{h}})$ where $\bar{x}$ is the geometric point of $\operatorname{Spec} B$ above the maximal ideal, and $\mathrm{Cl}(B^{\mathrm{h}})$ is the local Picard group. This map is surjective since, for each étale neighborhood V of $\bar{x}$, the

group $\mathrm{Cl}(\mathcal{O}(V))$ is generated by classes of Weil divisors D on V and we can take $\mathcal{O}(\pi^{-1}(D)) \in \mathrm{Pic}(\pi^{-1}(V))$ as their inverse images. Since the source is generated by the classes of $E_1, \dots, E_m$, the G-action on it factors through a group of order $m!$, and if $m = 2$ its eigenvalue -1 has multiplicity 1. It suffices to check that the G-action on $\mathrm{Cl}(B^{\mathrm{h}})$ is not a quotient of this type.

Case A_1: By some calculation as in the symplectic case, it follows that, after extending K, we have $B^{\mathrm{h}} \cong \mathcal{O}_K[x,y,z]^{\mathrm{h}}/(F)$, $F = xy + z^2 - q^2$, with $q \in \mathfrak{p}$ and $g(x,y,z) = (ax, a^{-1}y, -z)$. Since $\mathrm{Cl}(B^{\mathrm{h}})$ is an infinite cyclic group generated by $[D_+] = -[D_-]$, where $D_\pm = (x = z \pm q = 0)$, g acts on $\mathrm{Cl}(B^{\mathrm{h}})$ by -1 (cf. [LM15, Section 6]). Hence $\mathrm{Cl}(B^{\mathrm{h}})$ cannot be the image of $(R^1\pi_*\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}^*)_{\bar{x}}$.

Case A_2: Likewise, after extending K we have $B^{\mathrm{h}} \cong \mathcal{O}_K[x,y,z]^{\mathrm{h}}/(F)$, $F = xy + z^3 + q_2z^2 + q_1z + q_0$, $q_l \in \mathfrak{p}$, and that one of the following holds.

- $g(x,y,z) = (ax, -a^{-1}y, -z)$, $q_2 = q_0 = 0$.
- $g(x,y,z) = (ax, a^{-1}y, \zeta_3 z)$, $q_2 = q_1 = 0$.
- $g(x,y,z) = (y, x, z)$.
- $g(x,y,z) = (y, x, \zeta_3 z)$, $q_2 = q_1 = 0$.

Only in the third and the fourth cases g swaps E_1 and E_2. To compute the action on $\mathrm{Cl}(B^{\mathrm{h}})$, we can use the generators X_i, Y_i $(i = 1,2,3)$, subject to relations $X_i + Y_i = \sum X_i = \sum Y_i = 0$, defined by $X_i = [(x, z - \alpha_i)]$, $Y_i = [(y, z - \alpha_i)]$ where $\prod(z - \alpha_i) = z^3 + q_2z^2 + q_1z + q_0$ is the decomposition. In the the fourth case the action of g on $\mathrm{Cl}(B^{\mathrm{h}})$ is of order 6. In the third case, the action of g on $\mathrm{Cl}(B^{\mathrm{h}})$ is of order 2 but its eigenvalue -1 has multiplicity 2. Hence $\mathrm{Cl}(B^{\mathrm{h}})$ cannot be the image of $(R^1\pi_*\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}^*)_{\bar{x}}$. □

4. G-equivariant flops

In this section we prove the existence and termination of G-equivariant flops for G-models of K3 surfaces (more generally surfaces with numerically trivial canonical divisor), relying on the results in our previous paper [LM15, Section 3].

4.1. **A complement to Liedtke–Matsumoto.**

In this subsection we recall the result of [LM15, Section 3] on the existence and termination of flops between proper smooth models of a fixed K3 surface.

The following definitions, taken from [LM15, Section 3][1], are adjustments of those in [KM98, Definitions 3.33 and 6.10] to our situation of models of surfaces.

Definition 4.1. Let X be a smooth and proper surface over K with numerically trivial $\omega_{X/K}$ that has a proper smooth model $\mathcal{X} \to \mathrm{Spec}\,\mathcal{O}_K$. Then,

(1) A proper and birational morphism $f\colon \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}$ over $\mathcal{O}_K$ is called a *flopping contraction* if $\mathcal{Y}$ is normal, $\omega_{\mathcal{X}/\mathcal{O}_K}$ is numerically f-trivial, and the exceptional locus of f is of codimension at least 2.

[1] These definitions do not explicitly appear in the present version (`arXiv:1411.4797v2`). They do only in the upcoming version.

(2) If D is a Cartier divisor on $\mathcal{X}$, then a birational map $\mathcal{X} \dashrightarrow \mathcal{X}^+$ over $\mathcal{O}_K$ is called a *D-flop* if it decomposes into a flopping contraction $f\colon \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}$ followed by (the inverse of) a flopping contraction $f^+\colon \mathcal{X}^+ \to \mathcal{Y}$ such that $-D$ is f-ample and D^+ is f^+-ample, where D^+ denotes the strict transform of D on $\mathcal{X}^+$.
(3) A morphism f^+ as in (2) is also called a *flop* of f.

A flop of f, if exists, does not depend on the choice of D by [KM98, Corollary 6.4, Definition 6.10]. This justifies talking about flops without referring to D.

In [LM15, Section 3] we proved that:

Proposition 4.2 (Existence & Termination of Flops, [LM15, Propositions 3.1, 3.2])**.** *Let X be a surface over K with numerically trivial canonical divisor, and $\mathcal{Y}$ a proper smooth model of X over $\mathcal{O}_K$. Let $\mathcal{L}$ be an ample line bundle on X, and denote by $\mathcal{L}_0$ the restriction to $\mathcal{Y}_0$ of the extension to $\mathcal{Y}$ of $\mathcal{L}$. Then we have the following.*

(a) Let $Z = \bigcup C_i$ be a union of finitely many $\mathcal{L}_0$-negative integral curves C_i. Then we have a flopping contraction $f\colon \mathcal{Y} \to \mathcal{Y}'$ contracting C_i's and no other curves, and we have its flop $\mathcal{Y} \dashrightarrow \mathcal{Y}^+$ over $\mathcal{O}_K$. $\mathcal{Y}^+$ is again a proper smooth model of X over $\mathcal{O}_K$.

(b) After applying finitely many flops as in (a), we arrive at a proper smooth model $\mathcal{Y}^\dagger$ of X such that $\mathcal{L}_0^\dagger$ is nef.

Remark 4.3. (1) As showed in the proof of [LM15, Proposition 3.1], there are only finitely many $\mathcal{L}_0$-negative curves, and over $\overline{k}$ those curves are smooth rational curves forming finitely many ADE configurations. In particular the irreducible components of $Z_{\overline{k}}$ are again smooth rational curves again forming finitely many ADE configurations.

(2) In [LM15, Proposition 3.1], part (a) is stated only for a single integral (not necessarily geometrically integral) curve Z. But the same proof applies to the case of connected Z, and we can reduce the general case to the connected case (since the flop at one connected component of Z does not affect the $\mathcal{L}_0$-degrees of the curves on the other components).

In the present version of [LM15] this proposition is proved only under the assumption $p \neq 2$ (the assumption is removed in the upcoming version). For the reader's convenience we explain how to remove the assumption.

Proof. (a) We follow the proof of [LM15, Proposition 3.1]. As in that proof we obtain, without using the assumption $p \neq 2$, the contraction $f\colon \mathcal{Y} \to \mathcal{Y}'$ contracting C_i's to a point w and contracting no other curves. Let $\hat{w}$ be the formal completion of $\mathcal{Y}'$ along w and let $\hat{\mathcal{Z}} \to \hat{w}$ be the formal fiber over $\hat{f}$. Then $\hat{w}$ is a formal affine scheme, say $\operatorname{Spf} R$, and we may assume the residue field of R is k. The special fiber of $\operatorname{Spf} R$ is a rational singularity of multiplicity 2. By [Lip69, Lemma 23.4], the completion of the local ring of the special fiber is of the form $k[[x, y, z]]/(h'(x, y, z))$, with

$h' \in (x,y,z)^2$ and $h' \notin (x,y,z)^3$. Under the assumption $p = \operatorname{char} k \neq 2$, we may assume after a change of coordinate that the power series $h'(x,y,z)$ is of the form $z^2 - h(x,y)$ for some polynomial $h(x,y)$. If p may be equal to 2, we may still assume that h' is of the form $z^2 - h_1(x,y)z - h_0(x,y)$ for some power series $h_i(x,y)$. The completion of R is of the form $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_K[[x,y,z]]/(H')$, $H' = z^2 - H_1(x,y)z - H_0(x,y)$, where $H_i(x,y)$ is congruent to $h_i(x,y)$ modulo the maximal ideal of $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_K$. We denote by $t\colon \operatorname{Spf} R \to \operatorname{Spf} R$ the involution induced by $z \mapsto H_1(x,y) - z$. Then t induces $-\mathrm{id}$ on the local Picard group since, for a divisor D of $\operatorname{Spf} R$ we have $D + t(D) = \pi^*\pi_*(D)$ where π is the double covering $\pi\colon \operatorname{Spf} \hat{\mathcal{O}}_K[[x,y,z]]/(H') \to \operatorname{Spf} \hat{\mathcal{O}}_K[[x,y]]$ (cf. [Kol89, Example 2.3]). We denote by $\hat{\mathcal{Z}}^+ \to \hat{w}$ the composition $t \circ \hat{f}$. By [Kol89, Proposition 2.2], this gives the desired flop formally. Then we can show, without using the assumption $p \neq 2$, that this is induced from a morphism of algebraic spaces.

(b) The proof of [LM15, Proposition 3.2] applies. □

We recall another result (also OK for $p = 2$).

Proposition 4.4 ([LM15, Section 3][2])**.** *Let X be a K3 surface over K with good reduction. Let $\mathcal{L}$ an ample line bundle of X. Then there exists a projective RDP model $\mathcal{X}$ of X, the extension of $\mathcal{L}$ to which is relatively ample. Such $\mathcal{X}$ is unique up to isomorphism.*

Proof (sketch). Start from a proper smooth model $\mathcal{Y}$ of X. Applying Proposition 4.2, we may assume the restriction $\mathcal{L}_0$ to $\mathcal{Y}_0$ of the extension to $\mathcal{Y}$ of $\mathcal{L}$ is nef and big. Then we can show that, for suitable m, the image of $|\mathcal{L}^{\otimes m}|\colon \mathcal{Y} \to \mathbb{P}^N_{\mathcal{O}_K}$ is a projective RDP model of the desired type. Uniqueness follows from a Matsusaka–Mumford type result. □

4.2. **G-equivariant flops.** We prove the following G-equivariant version.

Proposition 4.5. *Let X, $\mathcal{Y}$, $\mathcal{L}$ as in Proposition 4.2. Assume X is equipped with an action of a finite group G, $\mathcal{Y}$ is a G-model, and $\mathcal{L}$ is G-invariant.*

(a) Let Z as in part (a) of Proposition 4.2, and assume Z is G-stable. Then G acts canonically on the resulting model $\mathcal{Y}^+$ and the flop is a G-equivariant rational map.

(b) After applying finitely many flops as in (a), we arrive at a proper smooth G-model $\mathcal{Y}^\dagger$ of X such that $\mathcal{L}_0^\dagger$ is nef.

Proof. (a) This essentially follows from the uniqueness of the flop, as follows.

Giving a G-action on $\mathcal{Y}^+$ compatible with that on X is equivalent to giving, for each $g \in G$, an isomorphism $\mathcal{Y}^+ \xrightarrow{\sim} g^*\mathcal{Y}^+$ extending the identity $X \xrightarrow{\sim} X$, where $g^*\mathcal{Y}^+$ is the normalization of $\mathcal{Y}^+$ in the pullback $g\colon X \to X$. (It is required that the isomorphisms be compatible with the group structure, but once we have morphisms this is automatic since it is trivially true on a dense open subspace X.)

[2]Explicitly stated only in the upcoming version.

Now consider the diagram $\mathcal{Y} \to \mathcal{Y}' \leftarrow \mathcal{Y}^+$, the flop at Z. By taking the normalization under the pullback $g\colon X \to X$, we obtain $g^*\mathcal{Y} \to g^*\mathcal{Y}' \leftarrow g^*\mathcal{Y}^+$. By taking composite with the isomorphism $\mathcal{Y} \xrightarrow{\sim} g^*\mathcal{Y}$ induced from the G-action on $\mathcal{Y}$, this diagram becomes $\mathcal{Y} \to g^*\mathcal{Y}' \leftarrow g^*\mathcal{Y}^+$, the flop at $g^*(Z)$. Since $g^*(Z) = Z$, the two flopping contractions are the same and the two flops are the same, hence there are isomorphisms $\mathcal{Y}' \xrightarrow{\sim} g^*\mathcal{Y}'$ and $\mathcal{Y}^+ \xrightarrow{\sim} g^*\mathcal{Y}^+$ extending the identity on the generic fiber.

(b) Assume $\mathcal{L}_0$ is not nef, and take an $\mathcal{L}_0$-negative curve C on $\mathcal{Y}$. Since $\mathcal{L}$ is G-invariant, images of C under G are all $\mathcal{L}_0$-negative. We can apply part (a) to the union Z of those images. Therefore we can conclude from part (b) of Proposition 4.2. □

Proposition 4.6. *Let $X, \mathcal{L}$ be as in Proposition 4.4, $G \subset \mathrm{Aut}(X)$ a subgroup, and assume $\mathcal{L}$ is invariant under G. Then $\mathcal{X}$ is naturally a G-model.*

Proof. The uniqueness induces a G-action, as in the previous proposition. □

Remark 4.7. This can be applied only to finite G, since for an ample line bundle $\mathcal{L}$ on a K3 surface $\mathrm{Aut}(X, \mathcal{L})$ is finite [Huy16, Proposition 5.3.3].

5. Proof of main theorems

Using the results of previous two sections, we can prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Take a proper RDP G-model $\mathcal{X}'$ which is a scheme (this can be achieved by taking a G-invariant ample line bundle of X and then applying Proposition 4.6). It remains to show that $\mathcal{X}'$ admits a simultaneous G-resolution. By Theorem 1.3, for each $x \in \mathcal{X}^{\mathrm{nonsm}}$ there is a simultaneous G_x-equivariant resolution of $\operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},x}$, where $G_x = \mathrm{Stab}(x)$. We choose a family $(\mathcal{Y}(x) \to \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},x})_{x \in \mathcal{X}^{\mathrm{nonsm}}}$ of local simultaneous G_x-equivariant resolution satisfying $g^*\mathcal{Y}(x) = \mathcal{Y}(g^{-1}(x))$. To show that this is possible, we consider a G-orbit O of $\mathcal{X}^{\mathrm{nonsm}}$, take one $x \in O$ and choose one simultaneous G_x-resolution $\mathcal{Y}(x)$, and then for each other $x' = g^{-1}(x) \in O$ we take $\mathcal{Y}(x')$ to be $g^*\mathcal{Y}(x)$, which does not depend on the choice of g since $\mathcal{Y}(x)$ is a G_x-resolution. Gluing $\mathcal{Y}(x)$ we obtain a (global) G-equivariant simultaneous resolution of $\mathcal{X}'$. □

This also proves part (1) of Theorem 5.1 below.

Next we consider Theorem 1.2.

As explained in the introduction, we have two methods to prove non-extendability of automorphisms. We introduce the first one, relying on birational geometry of G-models developed in the previous section, to prove the case of non-symplectic automorphisms of finite order prime to p.

Theorem 5.1. *Let X be a (smooth) K3 surface over K, G a finite subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ of order prime to p, and $\mathcal{X}$ a projective RDP G-model of X.*

(1) If $G_x = \mathrm{Stab}(x)$ is symplectic for any $x \in \mathcal{X}^{\mathrm{nonsm}}$, then $\mathcal{X}$ admits a G-equivariant simultaneous resolution, in particular G is extendable.

(2) If G_x is non-symplectic for some $x \in \mathcal{X}^{\mathrm{nonsm}}$, then G is not extendable.

Proof. (1) This follows as in the proof of Theorem 1.1 above (in this case we need only properness of $\mathcal{X}$ instead of projectiveness).

(2) Assume there exists, after extending K, a proper smooth G-model $\mathcal{Y}$ of X. Note that then $\omega_{\mathcal{Y}/\mathcal{O}_K}$ is numerically trivial, as it is trivial on the generic fiber.

Take a relative ample line bundle on $\mathcal{X}$, which we may assume to be G-invariant. Then by Proposition 4.6 we obtain a proper smooth G-model $\mathcal{Y}^\dagger$ equipped with a G-equivariant morphism $\mathcal{Y}^\dagger \to \mathcal{X}$. In other words it is a simultaneous G-resolution of $\mathcal{X}$. But since G_x is non-symplectic this contradicts Theorem 1.3. □

We give examples satisfying assumptions of Theorem 5.1 for p arbitrary, $G = \mathbb{Z}/l\mathbb{Z}$, $2 \leq l \leq 11$ prime, $l \neq p$.

We fix the notation on elliptic surfaces. If we say that we define X by the Weierstrass form $F(x,y,t) = y^2 + a_1(t)xy + a_3(t)y + x^3 + a_2(t)x^2 + a_4(t)x + a_6(t) = 0$ over a field k, with $a_i \in k[t]$ with $\deg a_i \leq 2i$, we actually mean that X is the projective variety $\operatorname{Proj} k[X_i, Y, Z_j]_{0\leq i\leq 2, 0\leq j\leq 6}/I$ where I is the inverse image of $(F) \subset k[x,y,t]$ under the ring homomorphism $k[X_i, Y, Z_j] \to k[x,y,t]$ defined by $X_i \mapsto xt^i, Y \mapsto y, Z_j \mapsto t^j$. In particular, X has $\operatorname{Spec} k[x,y,t]/(F)$ and $\operatorname{Spec} k[x',y',s]/(F')$ as open subschemes, where $F' = y'^2 + a_1'(s)x'y' + a_3'(s)y' + x'^3 + a_2'(s)x'^2 + a_4'(s)x' + a_6'(s)$, where $a_i'(s) = s^{2i}a_i(1/s) \in k[s]$, with gluing given by $x' = xt^{-4}, y' = yt^{-6}, s = t^{-1}$. (To cover X by affine schemes we need two more pieces corresponding to $x = y = \infty$ and $x' = y' = \infty$, but usually they are not important and are omitted.) If these two affine subschemes has only RDP singularity, then the projective variety is an RDP K3 surface. We also define projective $\mathcal{O}_K$-schemes in the same way, and have a similar criterion for the projective scheme to be an RDP model.

For two primes p, l with $2 \leq l \leq 11$, we define $X_{l,p}$ and its automorphism $\sigma_{l,p}$ by

$$
\begin{aligned}
X_{11,p}&\colon y^2 + yx + x^3 - (t^{11} - p) = 0, && y'^2 + s^2y'x' + x'^3 - s(1 - ps^{11}) = 0\\
X_{7,p}&\colon y^2 + yx + x^3 - (t^7 - p) = 0, && y'^2 + s^2y'x' + x'^3 - s^5(1 - ps^7) = 0\\
X_{5,p}&\colon y^2 + yx + x^3 - (t^5 - p)(t^5 - 1) = 0, && y'^2 + s^2y'x' + x'^3 - s^2(1 - ps^5)(1 - s^5) = 0\\
X_{3,p}&\colon y^2 + yx + x^3 - (t^3 - p)(t^9 - 1) = 0, && y'^2 + s^2y'x' + x'^3 - (1 - ps^3)(1 - s^9) = 0\\
X_{2,p}&\colon y^2 + yx + x^3 - (t^2 - p)(t^8 - 1) = 0, && y'^2 + s^2y'x' + x'^3 - s^2(1 - ps^2)(1 - s^8) = 0
\end{aligned}
$$

and $\sigma_{l,p}\colon X_{l,p} \to X_{l,p}\colon (x,y,t) \mapsto (x, y, \zeta_l t), (x', y', s) \mapsto (\zeta_l^{-4}x', \zeta_l^{-6}y', \zeta_l^{-1}s)$. Non-symplecticness is checked by using global 2-form $\omega = (2y+x)^{-1}dx \wedge dt = -(2y' + s^2x')^{-1}dx' \wedge ds$. Then the singular points of $X_{l,p}$ in characteristics

0 and p are as follows (here, and in the next section, we do not distinguish analytically non-isomorphic RDPs of the same Dynkin diagram):

l		char. 0	char. p
each l	$(x,y,t)=(0,0,0)$	—	A_{l-1}
$5,3,2$	$(x,y,t)=(0,0,1)$	—	A_{l^e-1} if $p=l$ (*)
7	$(x',y',s)=(0,0,0)$	E_8	E_8
5	$(x',y',s)=(0,0,0)$	A_2	A_2 if $p\neq 2$, E_7 if $p=2$
3	$(x',y',s)=(0,1,0)$	—	D_4 if $p=2$
2	$(x',y',s)=(0,0,0)$	A_2	A_2 if $p\neq 2$ E_7 if $p=2$

(*) $l^e=5,9,8$ for $l=5,3,2$ respectively (this appears in the factor $t^{l^e}-1$ in the formula).

Thus these formula define projective RDP σ-models $\mathcal{X}$. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ the RDP model obtained as in the first paragraph of the proof of Lemma 2.8. This is a projective RDP model. Moreover, since at each step each RDP on the generic fiber is σ-fixed, $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ admits a natural σ-action. Now assume $l\neq p$. Since the singularity of $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ at $(x,y,t)=(0,0,0)$ on the special fiber is fixed by σ (hence has a non-symplectic stabilizer) we can apply Theorem 5.1 to obtain examples for Theorem 1.2 for $G=\mathbb{Z}/l\mathbb{Z}$, $2\leq l\leq 11$, $l\neq p$.

We will also give examples which have projective smooth models for the case $G=\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$, $p\neq 2,3$.

Take an integer a satisfying $a\equiv 0 \pmod p$ and $a\neq 0$. Let $F=a^2z^6+(x^3-xz^2)^2+(y^3-yz^2)^2$. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be the double covering of $\mathbb{P}^2_{\mathcal{O}_K}$ defined by $w^2=F(x,y,z)$. It is clear that the points defined by $(p=w=x^3-xz^2=y^3-yz^2=0)$ are singular and hence $S=\mathcal{X}^{\mathrm{nonsm}}$ contains these points. A straightforward computation shows that $\mathcal{X}$ has no other singular points, and that all the points of S are k-rational and are RDPs of type A_1.

Let ι be the deck transformation $(x,y,z,w)\mapsto(x,y,z,-w)$. This defines an involution on $\mathcal{X}$, and all points of S are fixed by ι. Non-symplecticness of (the restriction $\iota|_X$ to the generic fiber X of) ι can be showed either by directly computing $(\iota|_X)^*(\omega)$ for a global 2-form $\omega=w^{-1}xyzd\log(y/x)\wedge d\log(z/x)$, or by checking that $\mathrm{Fix}(\iota|_X)=(w=0)$ is 1-dimensional (use Lemma 2.13). By Theorem 5.1 ι is not extendable.

The Weil divisors $\mathcal{C}_+$ and $\mathcal{C}_-$ defined by $\mathcal{C}_\pm=(w\pm az^3=x^3-xz^2+y^3-yz^2=0)$ are non-Cartier exactly at S, and it can be easily seen that $\mathrm{Bl}_{\mathcal{C}_+}\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathrm{Bl}_{\mathcal{C}_-}\mathcal{X}$ are projective smooth models of $\mathcal{X}$. (Since ι interchanges $\mathcal{C}_+$ and $\mathcal{C}_-$ and the two blow-ups are not isomorphic, these smooth models are not ι-models.)

The second method of proving non-extendability is to use Proposition 2.3 and Corollary 2.5.

In Sections 6.2 and 6.4 we give examples, for $2\leq p\leq 19$ resp. $2\leq p\leq 7$, of non-symplectic resp. symplectic automorphisms of order p specializing to the identity on the characteristic p fiber. In Section 6.5 we give examples, for $p\geq 2$, of (symplectic and non-symplectic) infinite order automorphisms

specializing to the identity. Together with Corollary 2.5(a) these examples prove the remaining cases of Theorem 1.2.

6. Automorphisms specializing to identity

6.1. **Restriction on the residue characteristic for finite order case.**

Proposition 6.1. *Let g be an automorphism of finite order of a K3 surface X over K in characteristic 0. If $\mathrm{sp}(g) = 1$, then the order of g is a power of the residue characteristic p.*

Proof. By replacing g with a power, we may assume g is of prime order l.

We have $g^*\omega = \zeta\omega$ with ζ an l-th root of 1, where ω is as in Lemma 2.12. Since $\mathrm{sp}(g) = 1$, we have $|\zeta - 1|_p < 1$. If g is non-symplectic ($\zeta \neq 1$), this implies $l = p$.

Assume now g is symplectic. Any symplectic automorphism on a K3 surface of finite prime-to-characteristic order has at least one fixed point (Lemma 2.13), so take $x \in \mathrm{Fix}(g)$. We may assume x is K-rational. Let x_0 be the specialization of x with respect to some proper RDP scheme g-model $\mathcal{X}$ of X (use Proposition 4.6 to find such $\mathcal{X}$). Clearly g acts non-trivially on $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},x_0}$. Therefore, as in the proof of Proposition 3.5(1), $\mathrm{sp}(g)$ cannot be $= 1$ if $l \neq p$. □

Corollary 6.2. *If $p \geq 23$, then no nontrivial automorphism of finite order of a K3 surface over K specializes to the identity.*

Proof. A K3 surface in characteristic 0 does not admit an automorphism of prime order ≥ 23 ([Nik79, Sections 3,5]). □

Remark 6.3. The converse of Proposition 6.1 does not hold in general, that is, there exists automorphisms of order p specializing to a nontrivial automorphism, as will be seen for the case $p = 11$ in Example 6.7. However, if $p \in \{13, 17, 19\}$, then the converse is true, as there is only one K3 surface with automorphism of order p, and in that case the automorphism specializes to identity, as we see in Section 6.3.

In the next two subsections we give examples of a K3 surface over $\mathbb{Q}_p(\zeta_p)$ equipped with a non-symplectic resp. symplectic automorphism of order p ($2 \leq p \leq 19$ resp. $2 \leq p \leq 7$) which specializes to identity. The strategy of the construction is simple: We give (an open subscheme of) a proper RDP model on which the automorphism g acts as $g\colon (x_i) \mapsto (a_i x_i)$ with some p-th roots a_i of 1. Since p-th roots of 1 are congruent to 1 modulo the maximal ideal of $\mathbb{Z}_p[\zeta_p]$, $\mathrm{sp}(g)$ is clearly trivial. We only need to check that the model is indeed an RDP model (i.e. that there are no worse singularities) and that g is not trivial on the generic fiber.

6.2. **Non-symplectic examples of finite order.**

For $3 \leq p \leq 19$, let X_p the example of [Kon92, Section 7] of a K3 surface in characteristic 0 with

a non-symplectic automorphism σ of order p. Explicitly, X_p and $\sigma = \sigma_p$ is given by the Weierstrass form

$$\begin{aligned}
X_3 &: y^2 = x^3 - t^5(t-1)^5(t+1)^2, & \sigma(x,y,t) &= (\zeta_3 x, y, t),\\
X_5 &: y^2 = x^3 + t^3 x + t^7, & \sigma(x,y,t) &= (\zeta_5^3 x, \zeta_5^2 y, \zeta_5^2 t),\\
X_7 &: y^2 = x^3 + t^3 x + t^8, & \sigma(x,y,t) &= (\zeta_7^3 x, \zeta_7 y, \zeta_7^2 t),\\
X_{11} &: y^2 = x^3 + t^5 x + t^2, & \sigma(x,y,t) &= (\zeta_{11}^5 x, \zeta_{11}^2 y, \zeta_{11}^2 t),\\
X_{13} &: y^2 = x^3 + t^5 x + t, & \sigma(x,y,t) &= (\zeta_{13}^5 x, \zeta_{13} y, \zeta_{13}^2 t),\\
X_{17} &: y^2 = x^3 + t^7 x + t^2, & \sigma(x,y,t) &= (\zeta_{17}^7 x, \zeta_{17}^2 y, \zeta_{17}^2 t),\\
X_{19} &: y^2 = x^3 + t^7 x + t, & \sigma(x,y,t) &= (\zeta_{19}^7 x, \zeta_{19} y, \zeta_{19}^2 t),
\end{aligned}$$

where ζ_p is a primitive p-th root of unity. Non-symplecticness can be checked by computing the action on a global 2-form $\omega = y^{-1}dx \wedge dt$.

Proposition 6.4. *Let $2 \le p \le 19$ be a prime. Let X be either $X_{p,p}$ in Section 5 ($2 \le p \le 11$) or X_p above ($3 \le p \le 19$) over $K = \mathbb{Q}_p(\zeta_p)$, and σ the corresponding automorphism of order p. Then $\tilde{X}$ has potential good reduction, and we have $\mathrm{sp}(\sigma) = \mathrm{id}$. Hence $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(\tilde{X})$ is not extendable.*

Proof. We will see that X is an RDP model. So we can apply Lemma 2.8 to prove potential good reduction at p, and then since $\zeta_p = 1$ in $\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p$ we have $\mathrm{sp}(g) = \mathrm{id}$, and σ is not extendable by Proposition 2.5(a). Since we have already checked $X_{p,p}$ in Section 5, it remains to check X_p is an RDP model.

On both fiber of X_3, there are two E_8 at $(x,y,t) = (0,0,0), (0,0,1)$ and one A_2 at $(0,0,-1)$. The generic fiber has no other singularities. The special fiber has one more A_2 at $(x',y',s) = (1,0,0)$ and no other singularities.

For $5 \le p \le 19$, the singularities of fibers of X_p are as follows, where $c_p = -4/27$ if $p = 5, 7$ and $c_p = -27/4$ if $p = 11, 13, 17, 19$ and $b_p = (-3/2)(a_6/a_4)$, where a_{2i} is the coefficient of x^{3-i}.

p		5	7	11	13	17	19
$(x,y,t) = (0,0,0)$	(both fibers)	E_7	E_7	A_2	—	A_2	—
$(x',y',s) = (0,0,0)$	(both fibers)	E_8	E_6	E_7	E_7	A_1	A_1
$(x,y,t) = (b_p, 0, c_p^{1/p})$	(special fiber)	A_4	A_6	A_{10}	A_{12}	A_{16}	A_{18}

□

Remark 6.5. For $p \in \{13, 17, 19\}$, $\mathrm{sp}(\sigma_p) = \mathrm{id}$ also follows from Dolgachev–Keum's result [DK09a, Theorem 2.1] that K3 surfaces in characteristic p do not admit automorphisms of order p if $p \ge 13$.

For $p \ge 5$, potential good reduction of X_p can be shown by the following argument. Since σ is a non-symplectic automorphism the field $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_p)$ acts on $T(X_p)_{\mathbb{Q}}$, where T denotes the transcendental lattice and $_{\mathbb{Q}}$ denotes $\otimes\mathbb{Q}$. By using the formula (cf. [Kon92])

$$\rho \ge 2 + \sum_{F\colon \text{fiber}} ((\text{the number of irreducible components in } F) - 1),$$

where $\sum$ is taken over (non-smooth) fibers F of $X_p \to \mathbb{P}^1$, we can easily check that $\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_p)} T(X_p)_{\mathbb{Q}} = 1$, i.e. X_p has complex multiplication by $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_p)$. Then by [Mat15b, Theorem 6.3] X_p has potential good reduction. (The cited theorem has an assumption on the residue characteristic, but in presence of elliptic fibration it can be weakened to $p \geq 5$ using argument for case (c) after Lemma 3.1 of [Mat15b].)

6.3. **Non-symplectic automorphisms of order** $13, 17, 19$**.**

Proposition 6.6. *Let $l \in \{13, 17, 19\}$.*

(1) There exists a unique K3 surface in characteristic 0 (up to isomorphism) equipped with an automorphism group of order l, and is isomorphic to $(X_l, \langle\sigma\rangle)$ defined in Section 6.2.

(2) X_l has potential good reduction over $\mathbb{Q}_p$ for any p including l, and σ is extendable if and only if $p \neq l$.

Proof. (1) This is (announced in [Vor83, Theorem 7] and) proved by Oguiso–Zhang [OZ00, Corollary 3].

(2) The case $p = l$ is done in the previous proposition. Assume $p \neq l$.

If $p \neq 2$ (and $p \neq l$), we easily observe that the singularity of X_l in characteristic p is the same to that in characteristic 0. If $p = 2$ and $l = 17$, we use another coordinate $x_1 = 2^{-14/17}x$, $y_1 = 2^{-21/17}(y + t)$, $t_1 = 2^{-4/17}t$. Then the equation is $-y_1(y_1 - t_1) + x_1^3 + t_1^7 x_1 = 0$, and the singularity in characteristic 2 is the same to that in characteristic 0 (an A_2 at $(x_1, y_1, t_1) = (0, 0, 0)$ and an A_1 at $(x_1', y_1', s_1') = (0, 0, 0)$). In both cases, we have a canonical simultaneous resolution as in the first part of the proof of Lemma 2.8, and σ extends to that proper smooth model.

If $p = 2$ and $l = 13$ resp. $l = 19$, in addition to $(x', y', s) = (0, 0, 0)$ of the same type (E_7 resp. A_1) to that in characteristic 0, there are extra singularities in characteristic 2: for each 13-th resp. 19-th root a of 1, $(x, y, t) = (a^5, a, a^2)$ resp. (a^7, a, a^2) is an A_1, and σ acts on these points cyclically. The stabilizer of each point is trivial, in particular symplectic. First we resolve $(x', y', s) = (0, 0, 0)$ as in the previous case, and then apply Theorem 5.1(1) to obtain a proper smooth σ-model. □

Example 6.7. For $l \leq 11$ the situation is different. The following is a 1-dimensional example over K of residue characteristic 11 in which extendability depends on the parameter.

For each $q \in K$, consider the RDP K3 surface and the (non-symplectic) automorphism defined by the equation

$$y^2 = x^3 + x + (t^{11} - q)$$

and $g\colon (x, y, t) \mapsto (x, y, \zeta t)$, $\zeta = \zeta_{11}$. This is one of the four 1-dimensional families in the classification of Oguiso–Zhang [OZ11] of K3 surfaces equipped with automorphisms of order 11.

Letting $b = \sqrt{-1/3}$, $r = (q + 2b^3)^{1/11}$, $x' = x - b$, $w = t - r$, and $a_i = (\zeta^i - 1)/(\zeta - 1)$, we have

$$y^2 = x'^3 + 3bx'^2 + \prod_{i=0}^{10}(w - a_i r(\zeta - 1)),$$

$g\colon (x', y, w) \to (x', y, \zeta w + r(\zeta - 1))$.

If $|q^2 + 4/27| < |11|^{-22/10}$, equivalently $|r(\zeta - 1)| < 1$, (where $|\cdot| = |\cdot|_{11}$ is the 11-adic norm,) then this equation defines a proper RDP model and we have $\mathrm{sp}(g) = \mathrm{id}$, hence g is not extendable.

If $|q^2 + 4/27| \geq |11|^{-22/10}$, equivalently $|r(\zeta - 1)| \geq 1$, then letting $\alpha = ((r(\zeta - 1))^{11})^{-1/6}$, $X = \alpha^2 x'$, $Y = \alpha^3 y$, $u = w/(r(\zeta - 1))$, we have a proper smooth model

$$Y^2 = X^3 + 3b\alpha^2 X^2 + \prod(u - a_i),$$

$g\colon (X, Y, u) \mapsto (X, Y, \zeta u + 1)$. Thus g is extendable.

(Dolgachev–Keum [DK09b] gave a classification of a K3 surface in characteristic 11 equipped with an automorphism of order 11: it is either of the form

$$X_\varepsilon\colon y^2 + x^3 + \varepsilon x^2 + (u^{11} - u) = 0, \quad (x, y, u) \mapsto (x, y, u + 1),$$

which is the case in this example, or a nontrivial torsor (of order 11) of such an elliptic surface.)

6.4. **Symplectic examples of finite order.** In this section we give, for each prime $2 \leq p \leq 7$, an example of a K3 surface $X = X_p$ defined over $K = \mathbb{Q}_p(\zeta_p)$ and equipped with a symplectic automorphism σ of order p which specializes to identity. Moreover our X_p admits a projective smooth model (over some finite extension) for $p = 5, 7$.

We denote by μ_m the group of m-th roots of 1 and ζ_m a primitive m-th root of 1 (in the algebraic closure of a field of characteristic 0).

Case $p = 7$. Let X be the double sextic K3 surface defined by

$$w^2 + x_1^5 x_2 + x_2^5 x_3 + x_3^5 x_1 = 0.$$

We have $f\colon \mu_{126}/\mu_3 \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Aut}(X)$ by $f(t)\colon (w, x_i) \mapsto (w, t^{(-5)^i} x_i)$ for $t \in \mu_{126}$. Since $f(t)^*$ acts on $H^0(X, \Omega_X^2)$ by t^{21}, we have $f\colon \mu_{21}/\mu_3 \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathrm{symp}}(X)$. The existence of a symplectic automorphism of order 7 implies $\rho \geq 19$ (Corollary 2.14) where ρ is the geometric Picard number of X. The existence of an automorphism acting on $H^0(\Omega_X^2)$ by order 3 implies $22 - \rho$ even (since $\mathbb{Q}(\mu_3)$ acts on $T(X) \otimes \mathbb{Q}$). Hence $\rho = 20$. It is proved in [Mat15a, Corollary 0.5] that a K3 surface with $\rho = 20$ admits a projective smooth model after extending K (projectivity is not explicitly mentioned but follows from the proof).

We observe that the above equation defines a proper RDP model of X (the special fiber has 3 RDPs of type A_6 at $(w, x_1, x_2, x_3) = (0, 1, 1, 4)$, $(0, 1, 4, 1)$, $(0, 4, 1, 1)$). So we can compute $\mathrm{sp}(f(\zeta_7))$ on this model, and it is trivial.

Case $p = 5$. Let X be the quartic K3 surface defined by

$$x_1^3x_2 + x_2^3x_3 + x_3^3x_4 + x_4^3x_1 = 0.$$

We have $f\colon \mu_{80}/\mu_4 \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Aut}(X)$ by $f(t)\colon (x_i) \mapsto (t^{(-3)^i}x_i)$ for $t \in \mu_{80}$. Since $f(t)^*$ acts on $H^0(X, \Omega_X^2)$ by t^{-20}, we have $f\colon \mu_{20}/\mu_4 \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathrm{symp}}(X)$. The above equation again defines a proper RDP model (the special fiber has 4 RDPs of type A_4 at $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) = (1, -2a^3, 2a^2, a)$ for each primitive 8-th root a of 1).

It remains to show $\rho = 20$. [3] We have another symplectic automorphism $\tau\colon (x_i) \to (\zeta_{40}^i x_{i+1})$. Applying Corollary 2.14 to the group generated by $f(\mu_{20}/\mu_4)$ and τ (which has $1, 5, 10, 4$ elements of order $1, 2, 4, 5$ respectively) we obtain $\rho \geq 19$. The existence of an automorphism acting on $H^0(\Omega_X^2)$ by order 4 (e.g. $f(\zeta_{80})$) implies $22 - \rho$ even (since $\mathbb{Q}(\mu_4)$ acts on $T(X) \otimes \mathbb{Q}$).

Case $p = 3$. Let X be the double sextic K3 surface over K defined by

$$w^2 + x_0^6 + x_1^6 + x_2^6 + x_0^2x_1^2x_2^2 = 0.$$

Define $g \in \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathrm{symp}}(X)$ by $g\colon (w, x_0, x_1, x_2) \mapsto (w, x_0, \zeta_3 x_1, \zeta_3^2 x_2)$. The above equation defines a proper RDP model (the special fiber has 6 RDPs of type A_2 at $(w = x_0x_1x_2 = x_0^2 + x_1^2 + x_2^2 = 0)$).

Case $p = 2$. Let X be the quartic K3 surface over K defined by

$$w^3x + wx^3 + y^3z + yz^3 + wxyz = 0.$$

Define $g \in \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathrm{symp}}(X)$ by $g\colon (w, x, y, z) \mapsto (w, x, -y, -z)$. The above equation defines a proper RDP model (the special fiber has 4 RDPs of type A_3 at $(w, x, y, z) = (0, 1, 1, 1), (1, 0, 1, 1), (1, 1, 0, 1), (1, 1, 1, 0)$).

6.5. **Examples of infinite order.** In this section we give examples, in all residue characteristic $p \geq 2$, of automorphisms of infinite orders that specializes to the identity,

Consider a K3 surface X equipped with an elliptic fibration $X \to \mathbb{P}^1$, and a non-torsion section $Z \subset X$ of the fibration. Assume X admits a projective RDP model with an elliptic fibration $\mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{P}^1_{\mathcal{O}_K}$ and that the specialization of Z is the zero section plus some fibral components. Then the translation $\phi\colon X \to X$ by Z specializes to the identity on $\mathcal{X}_0$. It is known that translation on an elliptic K3 surface is symplectic [Huy16, Lemma 16.4.4].

Now we give an explicit example. Let X be the elliptic K3 surface defined by the equation $-y^2 - xy + x^3 - p^{12}x + t^6(t^6 + p^6) = 0$. Let Z be the section defined by $(x, y) = (t^6(t^6 + p^6)p^{-12}, t^{12}(t^6 + p^6)p^{-18})$. The singularity of the special fiber of X is as follows. An A_{11} at $(x = y = t = 0)$ for any p. If $p = 3$, an E_6 at $(x', y', s) = (-1, 0, 0)$. If $p = 2$, an D_7 at $(x', y', s) = (0, -1, 0)$.

ϕ has infinite order since its restriction to the fiber $(t = 1)$, which is a smooth elliptic curve over $\mathbb{Q}$, has infinite order by a Lutz-Nagell type result ([Sil86, Theorem VII.3.4]). Then, for any $m \geq 1$, ϕ^m is not extendable since $\phi^m \neq \mathrm{id}$ and $\mathrm{sp}(\phi^m) = \mathrm{id}$.

[3] Another proof: find 20 independent lines among the 52 lines given in Section 7.

Next let σ be the automorphism $(x, y, t) \mapsto (x, y, \zeta_6 t)$. Then the composite $\phi\sigma$ is not extendable since its power $(\phi\sigma)^6 = \phi^6$ is not extendable, and $\phi\sigma$ is non-symplectic since ϕ is symplectic and σ is not.

Similar example would exist also in equal characteristic 0. Also, Oguiso [Ogu03, Theorem 1.5(2)] gave an example of 1-dimensional family $\{X_t\}_{t\in\Delta}$ of complex K3 surfaces with $\mathrm{Aut}(X_t)$ are infinite for t outside a countable subset of Δ, but $\mathrm{Aut}(X_0)$ is finite.

7. An example in characteristic 3

In this section we give an example of a K3 surface X_K over $K = \mathbb{Q}_{3^4} = \mathbb{Q}_3(\zeta_{80})$ equipped with an automorphism g_K defined over K such that the characteristic polynomial of $\mathrm{sp}(g_K)$ is irreducible. By Corollary 2.5(2) this gives another example of Theorem 1.2 for $G = \mathbb{Z}$, $p = 3$. Apart from the theorem, the existence of g_K with the characteristic polynomial of $\mathrm{sp}(g_K)^*$ being irreducible would be itself interesting.

Let X_k be the Fermat quartic ($F = w^4 + x^4 + y^4 + z^4 = 0$) in $\mathbb{P}^3_k$ over $k = \mathbb{F}_{3^4}$. (This is the (unique) supersingular K3 surface with Artin invariant 1 in characteristic 3, but we do not need this fact.) Kondo–Shimada determined the lines on X_k and their explicit equations and showed that $\mathrm{NS}(X_{\overline{k}}) = \mathrm{NS}(X_k)$ is generated by those lines. We use their notation $l_1, \dots, l_{112}$ of [KS14][4].

Another coordinate $(u_1, u_4, u_2, u_3) = (w, x, y, z)M^{-1}$, where M is the matrix

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} \zeta^2-\zeta^3 & -1-\zeta^2 & -1+\zeta-\zeta^2 & \zeta-\zeta^4 \\ -\zeta^2+\zeta^3 & -1-\zeta^3 & -1-\zeta^3+\zeta^4 & -\zeta+\zeta^4 \\ \zeta^2-\zeta^4 & \zeta+\zeta^2 & -\zeta^2-\zeta^3+\zeta^4 & -1+\zeta+\zeta^3 \\ -\zeta+\zeta^3 & \zeta^3+\zeta^4 & \zeta-\zeta^2-\zeta^3 & 1-\zeta-\zeta^3 \end{pmatrix},$$

gives the formula $u_1^3u_2 + u_2^3u_4 + u_4^3u_3 + u_3^3u_1 = 0$. Here $\zeta = \zeta_5 \in \mathbb{F}_{3^4}$ is a primitive 5-th root of 1 satisfying $i = -1 + \zeta + \zeta^{-1}$. Let X_K be the quartic K3 surface over $K = \mathbb{Q}_{3^4}$ defined by this equation.

There are the following 52 lines $l^1_{(d,e)}$, l^2_a, l^3, l^4 on $X_{\overline{K}}$, all defined over $K = \mathbb{Q}_{3^4}$:

$$l^1_{(d,e)} \colon u_1 + edu_2 + d^3u_3 = u_4 - e^3d^3u_2 - du_3 = 0$$

for each of the 40 solutions (d, e) of $e^5 = 1$ and $d^8 - 3e^3d^4 + e = 0$,

$$l^2_a \colon u_1 - au_4 = u_2 + a^7u_3 = 0$$

for each of the 10 solutions a of $a^{10} = 1$, and $l^3 \colon u_2 = u_3 = 0$ and $l^4 \colon u_1 = u_4 = 0$. We observe that there are no more. We can calculate their specialization to X_k. For example, the line $u_1 - d'^9u_2 + d'^3u_3 = u_4 + d'^{27}u_2 - d'u_3 = 0$ on X_k, where $d' \in k$ is an 80-th root of 1, is the specialization of some $l^1_{(d,e)}$

[4] Table 2 in the published version has errors (e.g. the formulas for l_3 and l_5 are the same). Instead we refer to Table 3.1 in arXiv version (`arXiv:1205.6520v2`).

if and only if $d'^{40} = -1$. By explicit calculation (omitted) we observe that l_i comes from a line on X_K if and only if $i \in I$, where

$$I = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 13, 15, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 30, 33, 36,$$
$$37, 40, 41, 44, 45, 48, 51, 52, 57, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 70, 72, 74, 75, 78, 82,$$
$$86, 93, 98, 101, 102, 103, 104, 106, 109, 110, 111, 112\}.$$

Define divisor classes D_1 and D_2 on X_k by

$$D_1 = 3h - (l_{21} + l_{22} + l_{63} + l_{65} + l_{50} + l_{88}),$$
$$D_2 = 2h - (l_{65} + l_{66} + l_{70}),$$

where h denotes the hyperplane class (with respect to the embedding in $\mathbb{P}^3$). Since $l_{50} + l_{88} = h - l_5 - l_{112}$ (since the hyperplane section $(w + (-1-i)x + iy + (1-i)z = 0)$ is equal to the sum of these 4 lines), the classes D_i come from the classes $D_{i,K}$ of X_K.

We note that D_1 is the class m_1 in [KS14].

We easily verify that D_i are nef and that $D_i^2 = 2$, and hence $D_{i,K}$ have the same property. Hence we obtain generically 2-to-1 morphisms $\pi_i \colon X_k \to \mathbb{P}^2_k$ and $\pi_{i,K} \colon X_K \to \mathbb{P}^2_K$.

Claim 7.1. *(1) The exceptional divisors of π_1 are*

$$(l_{10}, l_{18}), (l_{16}, l_{99}), (l_{29}, l_{49}), (l_{60}, l_{73}), (l_{23}), (l_{37}), (l_{62}), (l_{68}), (l_{102}), (l_{112}),$$

and those of π_2 are

$$(l_{67}, l_{68}), (l_{90}, l_{94}), (l_{49}), (l_{54}), (l_{60}), (l_{63}), (l_{69}), (l_{97}), (l_{102}), (l_{107}), (l_{112}),$$

where the parentheses denote connected components.

(2) The exceptional divisors of $\pi_{1,K}$ are

$$(\tilde{l}_{10}, \tilde{l}_{18}), (C_{16,99}), (\tilde{l}_{23}), (\tilde{l}_{37}), (\tilde{l}_{68}), (\tilde{l}_{102}), (\tilde{l}_{112}),$$

and those of $\pi_{2,K}$ are

$$(\tilde{l}_{67}, \tilde{l}_{68}), (C_{90,94}), (\tilde{l}_{63}), (\tilde{l}_{102}), (\tilde{l}_{112}),$$

where $\tilde{l}_i$ is the (unique) line on X_K specializing to l_i and $C_{i,j}$ is the (unique) rational curve on X_K specializing to $l_i + l_j$.

We prove this later (in a brutal way). For π_1 this is already showed in [KS14] but we give another proof.

Let τ_i be the involutions on X_k induced by the deck transformations of π_i. Note that τ_i are specializations of the involutions $\tau_{i,K}$ on X_K defined by the classes $D_{i,K}$. Using the previous claim we can compute the $+1$-parts of $\tau_{i,K}^*$ and τ_i^* on H^2: the $+1$-part is freely generated by the pull-back of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(1)$ and the classes of connected components of the exceptional divisor (provided these components are all A_1 or A_2). By Proposition 2.3, $\tau_{i,K}$ are not extendable to proper smooth models.

We need one more automorphism. Let σ and σ_K be the diagonal linear transformations $(u_1, u_4, u_2, u_3) \mapsto (u_1, -u_4, iu_2, -iu_3)$ on X_k and X_K. (We

also have a more symmetric formula $(u_1, u_4, u_2, u_3) \mapsto (\zeta_{16}u_1, \zeta_{16}^9 u_4, \zeta_{16}^{-3}u_2, \zeta_{16}^{-27}u_3)$, where $\zeta_{16} = -1 + \zeta + \zeta_3$ is a 4-th root of $-i$.) (A linear automorphism diagonalized by this kind of basis also appears in [KS14, Example 3.4].)

Now let $g = \sigma\tau_2\tau_1\tau_2$. Clearly g is the specialization of $g_K = \sigma_K\tau_{2,K}\tau_{1,K}\tau_{2,K}$.

Claim 7.2. *The characteristic polynomial of g^* on $H^2_{\text{ét}}(X_{\overline{k}}, \mathbb{Q}_l)$ is equal to $F(x) =$*

$$x^{22} - 4x^{21} + 2x^{20} - 3x^{18} + 4x^{17} - 5x^{16} + x^{15} + x^{14} - 2x^{13} + 2x^{12} - 3x^{11}$$
$$+2x^{10} - 2x^9 + x^8 + x^7 - 5x^6 + 4x^5 - 3x^4 + 2x^2 - 4x + 1$$

and is irreducible.

Proof. We first prove irreducibility of this polynomial F. We have several ways. (1) We can ask a mathematical software (e.g. `SageMath`). (2) The irreducible decompositions of F mod 2 and F mod 3 imply irreducibility (we omit the details). (3) Assuming that F is the characteristic polynomial of g^*, it has at most one non-cyclotomic irreducible factor by the following lemma. So it suffices to check F is prime to any cyclotomic polynomial of degree ≤ 22 (we omit the verification).

Lemma 7.3 ([McM02, Corollary 3.3],[Ogu10, Section 2.2])**.** *Let f be an isometry of a lattice L (over $\mathbb{Z}$) of signature $(+1, -(r-1))$ and assume f preserves a connected component of $\{x \in L \mid x^2 > 0\}$. Then the characteristic polynomial of f has at most one non-cyclotomic irreducible factor. Moreover that factor (if exists) is a Salem polynomial, that is, an irreducible monic integral polynomial that has exactly two real roots, $\lambda > 1$ and λ^{-1}, and the other roots (if any) lie on the unit circle.*

Since $H^2_{\text{ét}}(X_{\overline{k}}, \mathbb{Q}_l)$ is generated by algebraic cycles (defined over k), it suffices to compute the action on $\mathrm{NS}(X_k) \otimes \mathbb{Q}$.

The transformation matrix of τ_1 with respect to the basis $\beta_1 =$

$$\{l_{23}, l_{37}, l_{62}, l_{68}, l_{102}, l_{112}, l_{10} + l_{18}, l_{16} + l_{99}, l_{29} + l_{49}, l_{60} + l_{73}, D_1,$$
$$l_{10} - l_{18}, l_{16} - l_{99}, l_{29} - l_{49}, l_{60} - l_{73}, l_2 - l_{33}, l_4 - l_{11}, l_5 - l_{24}, l_7 - l_{85},$$
$$l_{13} - l_{67}, l_{30} - l_{87}, 2l_3 + l_{112} - (l_{10} + l_{18} + l_{16} + l_{99} + l_{90} + l_{94})\}$$

is $T_1' = \mathrm{diag}(\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{11}, \underbrace{-1, \dots, -1}_{11})$.

The transformation matrix of τ_2 with respect to the basis $\beta_2 =$

$$\{l_{67} + l_{68}, l_{90} + l_{94}, l_{49}, l_{54}, l_{60}, l_{63}, l_{69}, l_{97}, l_{102}, l_{107}, l_{112}, D_2,$$
$$l_{67} - l_{68}, l_{90} - l_{94}, l_{45} - l_{82}, l_{24} - l_{75}, l_{36} - l_{79}, l_{30} - l_{81},$$
$$l_{39} - l_{76}, l_{25} - l_{86}, l_{42} - l_{85}, l_{10} - l_{18}\}$$

is $T_2' = \mathrm{diag}(\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{12}, \underbrace{-1, \dots, -1}_{10})$.

The transformation matrix of σ with respect to the basis $\beta_3 =$

$$\{l_7, l_{107}, l_{95}, l_{14}, l_{83}, l_{92}, l_{43}, l_{69}, l_{34}, l_{56}, l_{11}, l_{59}, l_{80}, l_{16}, l_{50}, l_{85}, l_{100}, l_{61}, l_{27}, l_{29}, l_{15}, l_{20}\}$$

is the 5-th power of the matrix

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} & & & & 1 & & \\ 1 & & & & & & \\ & \ddots & & & & & \\ & & & 1 & & & \\ & & & & & 1 & \\ & & & & & & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

(More precisely, σ is the 5-th power of the linear automorphism $\rho\colon (u_1, u_4, u_2, u_3) \mapsto (\zeta_{80}u_1, \zeta_{80}^{9}u_4, \zeta_{80}^{-3}u_2, \zeta_{80}^{-27}u_3)$, where $\zeta_{80} = \zeta - \zeta^3$ satisfies $\zeta_{80}^5 = \zeta_{16}$, and ρ acts on β_3 by R.)

From these information we can compute the action and the characteristic polynomial. Define $\psi\colon \mathrm{NS}(X_k) \otimes \mathbb{Q} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{Q}^{22}$ to be the isomorphism defined by $\psi(v) = (v \cdot l)_{l \in \beta_3}$. Let B_i be the matrices consisting of column vectors $\psi(v)$ $(v \in \beta_i)$. Then $T_i = (B_i^{-1}B_3)^{-1}T_i'(B_i^{-1}B_3)$ (for $i = 1, 2$) are the transformation matrices of τ_i with respect to the basis β_3. It remains to check that the characteristic polynomial of $R^5T_2T_1T_2$ is equal to F (omitted). We write down the B_i for convenience.

$$B_1 = \begin{pmatrix}
0&1&1&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&1&1&0&0&0&1&0&-1&1&-2&0&1&1\\
1&0&1&0&0&0&0&0&1&0&0&1&0&-1&0&0&1&0&0&0&0&1&-1\\
0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&1&1&1&0&0&-1&1&1&0&1&0&-1&0&-1\\
1&0&1&0&0&1&1&1&1&2&3&1&1&-1&0&0&0&0&0&0&1&-2\\
1&0&0&0&1&0&0&0&0&0&1&1&0&0&0&1&0&0&0&0&-1&-1&-1\\
0&0&0&1&0&0&0&0&1&1&1&2&0&-1&-1&1&0&0&0&-1&0&1&-2\\
0&0&0&0&0&0&0&1&0&0&1&1&-1&0&0&-1&0&0&0&0&-1&0&-1\\
0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&1&0&1&1&0&-1&0&-1&1&0&1&0&0&-1&-1\\
0&0&1&0&0&0&1&1&1&0&1&2&1&-1&0&1&-1&1&1&0&-1&-1&-2\\
0&1&0&0&0&1&1&1&1&1&2&1&-1&1&1&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&-1\\
1&0&0&1&0&0&1&1&1&1&2&1&-1&-1&-1&-1&2&0&1&0&0&0&\\
0&0&0&1&0&1&0&0&0&1&1&0&0&0&1&-1&0&0&0&0&-1&0&\\
0&0&1&1&0&0&1&0&0&0&1&1&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&-1&\\
0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&-1&0&0&0&0&-3&0&0&0&1&0&0&1&0&0\\
0&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&3&1&-1&-1&-1&0&1&1&0&0&1&-2\\
0&1&1&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&1&1&0&0&0&-1&0&1&-1&2&0&-1&-1\\
1&1&1&1&0&1&1&1&1&1&3&-1&-1&-1&1&1&0&0&0&0&-1&0&-2\\
0&0&1&0&0&1&0&0&1&0&1&0&0&-1&0&-1&1&0&0&-1&0&0&\\
1&1&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&1&0&1&0&0&-1&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&-1\\
0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&-1&0&0&0&0&-3&0&0&1&0&0&0&1&0\\
0&0&0&0&1&0&1&1&1&0&2&-1&1&1&0&0&-1&-1&0&1&0&0&\\
0&0&1&0&1&0&1&1&1&1&2&-1&-1&-1&1&0&0&-1&0&1&0&0&
\end{pmatrix},$$

$$B_2 = \begin{pmatrix}
0&1&0&0&1&0&0&0&0&0&0&1&0&1&0&-1&0&1&0&-1&0&0&\\
0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&-2&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&\\
1&1&1&1&1&1&0&0&0&0&0&2&1&-1&1&-1&1&-1&1&-1&1&0&\\
1&1&1&0&1&0&0&1&0&0&1&2&1&-1&0&0&-1&1&1&-1&0&1&\\
1&1&0&0&1&1&0&1&1&0&0&2&1&1&-1&-1&-1&-1&0&0&0&0&\\
1&1&1&1&1&1&0&0&0&0&0&2&-1&1&-1&1&-1&1&-1&1&-1&0&\\
1&0&0&1&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&1&1&0&-1&0&-1&0&1&0&1&-1&\\
0&0&0&0&0&0&-2&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&\\
1&0&0&0&1&0&0&0&0&0&0&1&1&0&-1&0&1&0&-1&0&1&1&\\
0&0&0&1&1&0&0&0&0&0&1&1&0&0&0&0&-1&-1&-1&-1&1&1&\\
1&0&1&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&1&-1&0&-1&0&-1&0&1&0&1&1\\
1&1&0&0&1&1&0&0&0&1&1&2&-1&-1&0&0&0&0&1&1&1&0&\\
1&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&1&0&0&0&1&-1&0&1&0&-1&0&-1&0&0&1\\
0&1&0&1&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&1&0&1&0&-1&0&-1&0&1&0&0\\
1&1&1&1&0&0&0&0&0&1&0&1&2&-1&-1&0&0&1&0&1&1&1&\\
0&1&0&0&0&0&0&0&1&0&0&0&1&0&-1&0&1&0&-1&0&-1&3&0\\
1&1&1&0&1&0&0&0&1&0&0&1&2&-1&1&0&0&1&-1&-1&1&0&-1\\
1&1&1&0&0&1&1&0&0&0&0&1&2&1&1&0&0&-1&-1&-1&-1&1&0\\
0&1&1&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&1&0&-1&0&-1&0&-1&0&1&0&0\\
0&0&1&0&0&1&0&1&0&0&0&1&0&0&-1&-1&1&1&1&1&0&0&\\
0&0&0&0&0&0&1&0&1&1&0&1&0&0&1&1&0&0&0&0&-1&-1&\\
0&0&1&0&1&0&0&0&1&0&0&1&0&0&1&1&-1&-1&0&0&1&-1&
\end{pmatrix},$$

$$B_3 = \begin{pmatrix}
-2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 1 & 0 \\
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -2 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2
\end{pmatrix}.$$

□

Proof of Claim 7.1. We first prove (2) assuming (1). Let $C \subset X_K$ be an (irreducible) exceptional curve for $\pi_{i,K}$. Then the specialization C_0 of C to X_k is the sum of exceptional curves and is connected, hence is either an exceptional curve for π_i or the sum of two exceptional curves forming an A_2 component. Since $C^2 \geq -2$, we observe that all components of C_0 have multiplicity 1. By checking liftability of the classes, we obtain the stated list. (The class $l_{16} + l_{99}$ is liftable to a class $C_{16,99}$ of X_K since it is equal to $h - l_{57} - l_{75}$ and the lines l_{57} and l_{75} are liftable. It is irreducible since the lines l_{16} and l_{99} are not liftable. The class $l_{29} + l_{49}$ is not liftable since it is equal to $h - l_{41} - l_{77}$ and the line l_{41} is liftable and l_{77} is not. The other cases are similar or simpler.)

We now prove (1). By computing the intersection numbers we see that the above curves are indeed exceptional. We need to show there are no more. First we consider π_2. We identify $H^0(X_k, \mathcal{O}(mD_2))$ with the space of homogeneous polynomials of degree $2m$ modulo F with vanishing order at least m at l_{65}, l_{66}, and l_{70}. Define linear polynomials $f_{65}, g_{65}, f_{70}, g_{70}$ by

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{65} &= w + (1+i)y \in H^0(X_k, \mathcal{O}(h - (l_{65} + l_{66}))), \\
g_{65} &= x + (1+i)z \ \in H^0(X_k, \mathcal{O}(h - (l_{65}))), \\
f_{70} &= x + (1-i)z \ \in H^0(X_k, \mathcal{O}(h - (l_{70} + l_{66}))), \\
g_{70} &= w + (1-i)y \in H^0(X_k, \mathcal{O}(h - (l_{70}))),
\end{aligned}$$

so that they vanish on the indicated lines. Let $A = f_{65}g_{70}$, $B = g_{65}f_{70}$, $C = f_{65}f_{70}$. Then A, B, C form a basis of $H^0(X_k, \mathcal{O}(D_2))$. Let $Y_1 = (1+i)f_{65}f_{70}(f_{65}^3 g_{70} + g_{65}^3 f_{70})$ and $Y_2 = (-1+i)f_{65}f_{70}(f_{65}g_{70}^3 + g_{65}f_{70}^3)$. Then we see $Y_1 - Y_2 = FC \equiv 0 \pmod F$, and Y_1 $(= Y_2)$ together with the ten cubic monomials of A, B, C form a basis of $H^0(X_k, \mathcal{O}(3D_2))$. We obtain the formula Y_1^2 $(= Y_1 Y_2) = A^3B^3 + (A^4 + B^4)C^2 + ABC^4$ and conclude that it has 13 exceptional curves (forming two A_2 and nine A_1). Hence the list above gives all exceptional curves.

Now we consider π_1. We identify $H^0(X_k, \mathcal{O}(mD_1))$ with the space of homogeneous polynomials of degree $3m$ modulo F with vanishing order at least m at each of l_{21}, l_{22}, l_{50}, l_{63}, l_{65}, and l_{88}. Define linear polynomials $a, b_1, c_1, d_1, c_2, d_2$ and a quadratic polynomial ϕ_2 by

$$\begin{aligned}
c_1 &= w + iy + (-i)z && \in H^0(X_k, \mathcal{O}(h - (l_{21} + l_{22}))),\\
c_2 &= w + (-i)x + (-1+i)y + (-1-i)z && \in H^0(X_k, \mathcal{O}(h - (l_{22} + l_{88}))),\\
d_1 &= w + (1+i)x + (-1-i)y + (-1)z && \in H^0(X_k, \mathcal{O}(h - (l_{21} + l_{50}))),\\
d_2 &= w + (-1-i)x + (i)y + (1-i)z && \in H^0(X_k, \mathcal{O}(h - (l_{50} + l_{88}))),\\
b_1 &= w + (-i)x + (1+i)y + (1-i)z && \in H^0(X_k, \mathcal{O}(h - (l_{21} + l_{65}))),\\
a &= w + ix + (1+i)y + (-1+i)z && \in H^0(X_k, \mathcal{O}(h - (l_{63} + l_{65}))),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\phi_2 = c_2 d_1 + (1+i) c_1 d_2 + c_2 d_2 \in H^0(X_k, \mathcal{O}(2h - (l_{22} + l_{50} + l_{63} + l_{88}))),$$

so that they vanish on the indicated lines. Let $P = ac_1d_2$, $Q = ac_2d_1$, and $R = b_1\phi_2$.

Then P, Q, R form a basis of $H^0(X_k, \mathcal{O}(D_1))$, and π_1 is given by $[P : Q : R]$. We compute the images of the above curves and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
l_{10}, l_{18} &\to S_{10,18} = (0:0:1),\\
l_{16}, l_{99} &\to S_{16,99} = (1:0:1+i),\\
l_{29}, l_{49} &\to S_{29,49} = (1:1-i:1-i),\\
l_{60}, l_{73} &\to S_{60,73} = (1:-1-i:0),\\
l_{23} &\to T_{23} = (0:1:-1),\\
l_{37} &\to T_{37} = (1:-1+i:0),\\
l_{62} &\to T_{62} = (1:1+i:0),\\
l_{68} &\to T_{68} = (1:1+i:-i),\\
l_{102} &\to T_{102} = (1:-1+i:i),\\
l_{112} &\to T_{112} = (0:1:-1-i),
\end{aligned}$$

for each component. We look for sextic curve that have these 10 points as singular points. By a straightforward calculation (computer-aided, omitted) we observe that there is only one such sextic curve and its equation is

$$\begin{aligned}
G = (-1)Q^2R^4 + (-1+i)Q^3R^3 + Q^4R^2 + Q^5R + (i)Q^6 + (-i)PQR^4\\
+(-i)PQ^2R^3 + (-1-i)PQ^4R + (-1-i)PQ^5 + P^2R^4 + (-1)P^2QR^3\\
+(i)P^2Q^3R + (-1)P^3R^3 + (1+i)P^3Q^2R + (-1+i)P^3Q^3 + (-1)P^4R^2\\
+P^5R + (1+i)P^5Q + P^6.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $Y^2 = G(P, Q, R)$ is the equation of X_k relative to π_1. By a calculation (omitted) we observe that the points $S_{j,j'}$ resp. T_j are exactly cusps

resp. nodes, hence their fibers are exactly $l_j \cup l_{j'}$ resp. l_j. It remains to check there are no other singular points on this sextic. First we see that such singular point is necessarily $\mathbb{F}_9$ $(= k)$-rational since, if not, the fibers give classes of $\mathrm{NS}(X_{\overline{k}})$ that are not $\mathrm{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_9/\mathbb{F}_9)$-invariant, which is absurd because $\mathrm{NS}(X_{\overline{k}})$ is generated by lines defined over $\mathbb{F}_9$. So we only need to check $\mathbb{F}_9$-rational points on X_k, and as there are only 91 $\mathbb{F}_9$-rational points in $\mathbb{P}^2$, this can be done in a finite amount of calculation (omitted). □

References

[Art69] M. Artin, *Algebraic approximation of structures over complete local rings*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. **36** (1969), 23–58.

[Art74] ———, *Algebraic construction of Brieskorn's resolutions*, J. Algebra **29** (1974), 330–348.

[Art77] ———, *Coverings of the rational double points in characteristic p*, Complex analysis and algebraic geometry, Iwanami Shoten, Tokyo, 1977, pp. 11–22.

[Bri68] Egbert Brieskorn, *Die Auflösung der rationalen Singularitäten holomorpher Abbildungen*, Math. Ann. **178** (1968), 255–270 (German).

[Bri71] ———, *Singular elements of semi-simple algebraic groups*, Actes du Congrès International des Mathématiciens (Nice, 1970), Gauthier-Villars, Paris, 1971, pp. 279–284. MR0437798

[DK09a] Igor V. Dolgachev and JongHae Keum, *Finite groups of symplectic automorphisms of K3 surfaces in positive characteristic*, Ann. of Math. (2) **169** (2009), no. 1, 269–313.

[DK09b] ———, *K3 surfaces with a symplectic automorphism of order 11*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **11** (2009), no. 4, 799–818.

[Huy16] Daniel Huybrechts, *Lectures on K3 Surfaces*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 158, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2016.

[KM98] János Kollár and Shigefumi Mori, *Birational geometry of algebraic varieties*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, vol. 134, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998. With the collaboration of C. H. Clemens and A. Corti; Translated from the 1998 Japanese original.

[Kol89] János Kollár, *Flops*, Nagoya Math. J. **113** (1989), 15–36.

[Kon92] Shigeyuki Kondō, *Automorphisms of algebraic K3 surfaces which act trivially on Picard groups*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **44** (1992), no. 1, 75–98.

[KS14] Shigeyuki Kondō and Ichiro Shimada, *The automorphism group of a supersingular K3 surface with Artin invariant 1 in characteristic 3*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN **7** (2014), 1885–1924.

[LM15] Christian Liedtke and Yuya Matsumoto, *Good Reduction of K3 surfaces* (2015), available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1411.4797v2`.

[Lip69] Joseph Lipman, *Rational singularities, with applications to algebraic surfaces and unique factorization*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. **36** (1969), 195–279.

[Mat15a] Yuya Matsumoto, *On good reduction of some K3 surfaces related to abelian surfaces*, Tohoku Math. J. (2) **67** (2015), no. 1, 83–104.

[Mat15b] ———, *Good reduction criterion for K3 surfaces*, Math. Z. **279** (2015), no. 1–2, 241–266.

[McM02] Curtis T. McMullen, *Dynamics on K3 surfaces: Salem numbers and Siegel disks*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **545** (2002), 201–233.

[Muk88] Shigeru Mukai, *Finite groups of automorphisms of K3 surfaces and the Mathieu group*, Invent. Math. **94** (1988), no. 1, 183–221.

[Nik79] V. V. Nikulin, *Finite groups of automorphisms of Kählerian $K3$ surfaces*, Trudy Moskov. Mat. Obshch. **38** (1979), 75–137 (Russian). English translation: Trans. Moscow Math. Soc. **1980**, no. 2, 71–135.

[Ogu03] Keiji Oguiso, *Local families of $K3$ surfaces and applications*, J. Algebraic Geom. **12** (2003), no. 3, 405–433.

[Ogu10] ———, *Salem polynomials and the bimeromorphic automorphism group of a hyper-Kähler manifold*, Selected papers on analysis and differential equations, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2, vol. 230, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2010.

[OZ00] Keiji Oguiso and De-Qi Zhang, *On Vorontsov's theorem on $K3$ surfaces with non-symplectic group actions*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **128** (2000), no. 6, 1571–1580.

[OZ11] ———, *K3 surfaces with order 11 automorphisms*, Pure Appl. Math. Q. **7** (2011), no. 4, Special Issue: In memory of Eckart Viehweg, 1657–1673.

[Sil86] Joseph H. Silverman, *The arithmetic of elliptic curves*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 106, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1986.

[Vor83] S. P. Vorontsov, *Automorphisms of even lattices arising in connection with automorphisms of algebraic $K3$-surfaces*, Vestnik Moskov. Univ. Ser. I Mat. Mekh. **2** (1983), 19–21 (Russian, with English summary). English translation: Moscow Univ. Math. Bull. **38** (1983), no. 2, 21–24.

Graduate School of Mathematics, Nagoya University, Furocho, Chikusaku, Nagoya, 464-8602, Japan

E-mail address: matsumoto.yuya@math.nagoya-u.ac.jp